

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

CHARLES J. SISSON

AND

EDMUND G. GARDNER

VOLUME XXVII



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1932

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

ARTICLES.	PAGE
BELL, ALEXANDER, Buern Bucecarle in 'Gaimar'	168
BELL, AUBREY F. G., The Origin of the 'Cossantes'	175
BETHURUM, DOROTHY, Stylistic Features of the Old English Laws	263
BYROM, H. J., The Case for Nicholas Grimald as Editor of 'Tottell's Miscellany'	125
CLOSS, AUGUST, 'Die Teufelsbeichte,' ein Mittelhochdeutsches Exemplum	293
HUGHES, MERRITT Y., The Lineage of the 'Extasie'	1
IVES, DORIS V., 'A Man of Religion'	144
JEFFERY, VIOLET M., Shakespeare's Venice	24
JONES, GWYN, The Religious Elements of the Icelandic 'Hólmganga'	307
KASTNER, L. E., Notes on the Poems of Bertran de Born, I	398
KNIGHT, A. H. J., Some Reflections on Spitteler's 'Prometheus und Epimetheus'	430
LAWRENCE, W. J., The Mystery of 'The Stage Coach'	392
MATTHEWS, W., Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos	243
PARKER, ADELAIDE, and E. ALLISON PEERS, The Vogue of Victor Hugo in Spain	36
ROBERTSON, J. G., Sophie von La Roche's Visit to England in 1786	196
SARMIENTO, E., Gracián's 'Agudeza y arte de ingenio'	280, 420
TATLOCK, J. S. P., Mohammed and his Followers in Dante	186
TILLOTSON, GEOFFREY, The commonplace Book of Arthur Capell	381
WRIGHT, B. A., Milton's First Marriage, II	6
WRIGHT, HERBERT G., Southey's Relations with Finland and Scandinavia	149
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.	
BARRETT, W. P., Matthew Prior's 'Alma'	454
DAY, MABEL, 'Mele tyme of seintes,' 'Piers Plowman,' B, v. 500	317
ELOVSON, HARALD, 'Mr Kristrom' in Boswell's 'Life of Dr Johnson'	210
GREG, W. W., The Continuity of Alliterative Tradition	453
MOZLEY, J. H., Nigel Wireker or Wetekre?	314
NORMAN, F., An Unknown Middle High German 'Tageliet'	63
REDBOND, W. J., Notes on the Word 'Garsecg'	204
ROSS, ALAN S. C., Notes on Some Words in the 'Lindisfarne Gospels'	451
SEDGEFIELD, W. J., Emendations of the 'Beowulf' Text	448
SIMMONS, ERNEST J., Byron and a Greek Maid	318
SPINK, GERALD W., A Letter and Advertisement by Gottfried Kinkel	68
TOYNBEE, PAGET, Gray on the Origin and Date of 'Amadis de Gaul'	60
TOYNBEE, PAGET, Horace Walpole's Memoir of the Poet Gray	58
VINCENT, E. R. P., Two Letters from Mary Shelley to Gabriele Rossetti	459
WARD, CHARLES E., A Biographical Note on John Dryden	206
WILLIAMS, J. KILLA, A Disputed Reading in 'Aucassin et Nicolette'	62
REVIEWS.	
Alexander, Sir W., Poetical Works, ed. by L. E. Kastner and H. B. Charlton (MERRITT Y. HUGHES)	79
Arnold, R. F., Allgemeine Bücherkunde zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte (J. G. ROBERTSON)	227
Ascoli, G., La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française au 17e siècle (MYSIE E. I. ROBERTSON)	103
Audra, E., L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope (JOHN BUTT)	481
Audra, E., Les Traductions françaises de Pope (1717-1825) (JOHN BUTT)	481
Bach y Rita, P., The Works of Pere Torroella (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE)	358
Bailey, J., Introductions to Jane Austen (H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS)	221
Battisti, C., Popoli e lingue nell' Alto Adige (ESTHER ISOPEL MAY)	351
Baylie, S., The Wizard, ed. by H. de Vocht (G. C. MOORE SMITH)	85
Bell, C. H., Peasant Life in Old German Epics (F. NORMAN)	361

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Boillot, F., <i>Psychologie de la construction dans la phrase française</i> (J. W. JEAFFRESON)	222
Brinkmann, H., <i>Sprachwandel und Sprachbewegungen in althochdeutscher Zeit</i> (A. C. DUNSTAN)	360
Brisset, F., <i>Laure de Pétrarque</i> (C. FOLIGNO)	357
Bröker, H., <i>Zu den Lautverhältnissen der Lancashire-Dialekte</i> (A. H. SMITH)	99
Burnaby, W., <i>Dramatic Works</i> , ed. by F. E. Budd (JAMES R. SUTHERLAND)	343
Campbell, L. B., <i>Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes</i> (H. B. CHARLTON)	82
Chambers, R. W., <i>Introduction to Beowulf</i> , 2nd ed. (F. KLAEBER)	462
Coleridge, S. T., <i>Shakespearean Criticism</i> , ed. by T. M. Raysor (PETER ALEXANDER)	97
Cours, J. de, <i>Francis Viel-Griffin</i> (P. M. JONES)	105
Dahlström, C. E. W. L., <i>Strindberg's Dramatic Expressionism</i> (W. ROSE)	111
Death and Liffe, ed. by Sir I. Gollancz (A. W. REED and R. W. CHAMBERS)	326
Debenedetti, S., <i>Le Canzoni di S. Protonotaro, I</i> (EDMUND G. GARDNER)	355
Debenedetti, S., <i>Testi antichi siciliani</i> (EDMUND G. GARDNER)	355
Dechamps, J., <i>Sur la légende de Napoléon</i> (EDMUND G. GARDNER)	224
Donne, John, <i>A Garland for, 1631-1931</i> , ed. by Th. Spencer (GEOFFREY TILLOTSON)	477
Egil's Saga, transl. by E. R. Eddison (EDITH C. BATTO)	231
Ellehauge, M., <i>Bernard Shaw in European Drama and Philosophy</i> (GEOFFREY WHITWORTH)	346
Fairchild, H. N., <i>The Romantic Quest</i> (HERBERT G. WRIGHT)	487
Gabrielson, A., <i>E. Bysshe's Dictionary of Rhymes</i> (A. H. SMITH)	99
Garrod, H. W., <i>Poetry and the Criticism of Life</i> (H. S. BENNETT)	71
Gebhardt, P. von, and H. Schauer, <i>J. G. Herder, seine Vorfahren und seine Nachkommen</i> (A. GILLIES)	108
Gifford, G., <i>Dialogue concerning Witches and Witchcraftes</i> , ed. by B. White (W. W. GREG)	329
Glunz, H., <i>Die Verwendung des Konjunktivs im Altenglischen</i> (A. H. SMITH)	98
Goldsmith, O., <i>The Grumbler, an Adaptation by</i> , ed. by A. I. Perry Wood (V. DE SOLA PINTO)	483
Góngora, L. de, <i>The Solitudes</i> , transl. by E. M. Wilson (WILLIAM C. ATKINSON)	493
Guilpin, E., <i>A Shadowe of Truth</i> , ed. by G. B. Harrison (W. W. GREG)	329
Haber, T. B., <i>A Comparative Study of the Beowulf and the Aeneid</i> (RITCHIE GIRVAN)	466
Halperin, M., <i>Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans la littérature anglo-américaine</i> (FREDERIC I. CARPENTER)	490
Ham, R. G., <i>Otway and Lee</i> (JAMES R. SUTHERLAND)	342
Harrison, G. B., <i>A Second Elizabethan Journal</i> (CHARLES J. SISSON)	214
Hartland, R. W., <i>Walter Scott et le roman 'frénétique'</i> (L. W. TANCOCK)	350
Hartman, H., <i>Hartley Coleridge</i> (ARTHUR BEATTY)	488
Häusermann, H. W., <i>Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittelenglischen</i> (A. H. SMITH)	98
Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Servingmen, ed. by A. V. Judges (W. W. GREG)	329
Hotson, L., <i>Shakespeare versus Shallow</i> (W. W. GREG)	218
Howe, S., <i>Wilhelm Meister and his English Kinsmen</i> (WILLIAM ROSE)	110
Ibsen, H., <i>Œuvres complètes</i> . Trad. par P. G. La Chesnais, II, III (J. G. ROBERTSON)	494
Johan ūz dem virgiere, herausg. von R. Priebisch (F. NORMAN)	229
Jolivet, A., <i>Le Théâtre de Strindberg</i> (J. G. ROBERTSON)	233
Jonson, Ben., ed. by C. H. Herford and P. Simpson (OLIVER ELTON)	331

Contents

vii

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>).	PAGE
Jutz, L., Die alemannischen Mundarten (A. C. DUNSTAN)	360
Karpf, F., Studien zur Syntax in den Werken Chaucers (A. H. SMITH)	98
Lawrence, W. W., Shakespeare's Problem Comedies (CHARLES J. SISSON)	216
Livius de Frulovisiis de Ferraria, T., Opera hactenus inedita recognovit C. W. Previt�-Orton (SIR EDMUND K. CHAMBERS)	470
Longaker, M., English Biography in the 18th Century (G. KITCHIN)	484
Lucena's Repetic�n, ed. by B. Matulka (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE)	358
Marlowe, C., The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, ed. by H. S. Bennett (SIR E. K. CHAMBERS)	77
Marlowe, C., Poems, ed. by L. C. Martin (G. BULLOUGH)	328
Matthiessen, F. O., Translation, an Elizabethan Art (KATHLEEN M. LEA)	88
Matulka, B., The Novels of Juan de Flores (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE)	358
M�rim�e, E., History of Spanish Literature (WILLIAM C. ATKINSON)	107
Meyer-L�bke, W., Romanisches etymologisches W�rterbuch, 1-6 (LOUIS BRANDIN)	101
Milton, J., The Manuscript of Paradise Lost, Book I, ed. by H. Darbi- shire (B. A. WRIGHT)	334
More, H., Philosophical Poems, ed. by G. Bullough (L. C. MARTIN)	90
More, Sir Thomas, English Works, ed. by W. E. Campbell, 1 (G. G. COULTON)	75
Nadler, J., Herder-Bildnisse (A. GILLIES)	108
Navigatio Sancti Brendani, an Old Italian Version, ed. by E. G. R. Waters (EDMUND G. GARDNER)	355
Nethercot, A. H., Abraham Cowley (L. C. MARTIN)	92
Norden, J., Vicissitudo Rerum, ed. by D. C. Collins (W. W. GREG)	329
Oakden, J. P., Alliterative Poetry in Middle English (A. H. SMITH)	72
Otway, Th., Works, ed. by J. C. Ghosh (HAROLD WILLIAMS)	478
Pepys Ballads, The, ed. by H. E. Rollins, v-vii (HAROLD WILLIAMS)	338
Phoenix Nest, The, ed. by H. E. Rollins (EDITH C. BATHO)	213
Richardson, L. N., A History of Early American Magazines (KENNETH B. MURDOCK)	486
Rose, W., Men, Myths and Movements in German Literature (J. G. ROBERTSON)	227
Rosenblatt, L., L'Art pour l'art dans la litt�rature anglaise (B. E. C. DAVIS)	345
Scherer, G., Zur Geographie und Chronologie des angels�chsichen Wortschatzes (A. H. SMITH)	98
Seelig, F., Die Komparation der Adjektiva und Adverbien im Alten- glischen (A. H. SMITH)	98
Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, LXVII, herausg. von W. Keller (G. C. MOORE SMITH)	476
Squers, P. W., The Matchless Orinda (L. C. MARTIN)	91
South, H. P., The Proverbs of Alfred (RITCHIE GERVAN)	324
Stamp, A. E., The Disputed Revels Accounts (W. J. LAWRENCE)	87
Stern, G., Meaning and Change of Meaning (SAMUEL MOORE)	491
Steuerwald, K., Die Londoner Vulg�rsprache in Thackerays Yellow- plush Papers (A. H. SMITH)	99
Taylor, D. C., William Congreve (JAMES R. SUTHERLAND)	94
Thomas, L.-P., G�ngora (WILLIAM C. ATKINSON)	493
Thompson, H. W., A Scottish Man of Feeling, Henry Mackenzie (ERNEST A. BAKER)	95
Torbarina, J., Italian Influence on the Poets of the Ragusan Republic (EDMUND G. GARDNER)	226
Trahard, P., Les ma�tres de la sensibilit� fran�aise, 1 (M. E. I. ROBERTSON)	347
Waldock, A. J. A., Hamlet, a Study in Critical Method (P. ALEXANDER)	84
White, H. C., English Devotional Literature (B. E. C. Davis)	333
Wiencke, H., Die Sprache Caxtons (A. H. SMITH)	99
Wilson, J. Dover, The Essential Shakespeare (C. J. SISSON)	473
Zwerina, H., Neuenglisch o gesprochen wie u (A. H. SMITH)	99

SHORT NOTICES.

	PAGE
Atkinson, N., <i>E. Sue et le roman-feuilleton</i>	365
Blankenagel, J. C., <i>The Drama of Heinrich von Kleist</i>	500
Cayado, H., <i>Eclogues</i> , ed. by W. P. Mustard	367
Chotzen, <i>Primitieve Keltistiek in den Nederlanden</i>	497
Coleman, E. D., <i>The Bible in English Drama</i>	238
Collitz, <i>Studies in Honor of Hermann</i>	370
Coronedi, P. H., <i>La Leggenda del san Graal nel romanzo di Tristano</i>	240
Cunningham, K., <i>Schiller und die französische Klassik</i>	242
Curme <i>Volume of Linguistic Studies, The</i>	370
Deane, C. V., <i>Dramatic Theory and the Rhymed Heroic Play</i>	236
Doorn, C. van, <i>The Character of Jonathan Swift</i>	364
Duns Scotto, <i>Summula scelta di scritti da D. Scaramuzzi</i>	366
Ebisch, W., and L. L. Schücking, <i>A Shakespeare Bibliography</i>	114
<i>Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, xvii, collected by W. H. Hadow</i>	495
<i>Essays by Divers Hands, ix, ed. by J. Bailey, x, by Sir. F. Younghusband</i>	363
Faguet, E., <i>Boileau</i>	240
Farnam, H. W., <i>Shakespeare's Economics</i>	114
Ford, J. D. M., and R. Lansing, <i>Cervantes Bibliography</i>	367
Franz, W., <i>Shakespeares Blankvers</i>	496
Goethe, J. W. von, <i>Voyage en Italie</i> , trad. par M. Mutterer	242
Gordon, G., <i>Virgil in English Poetry</i>	362
Hamel, A. G. van, <i>Gotisch Handboek</i>	241
Hamer, E., <i>The Metres of English Poetry</i>	113
Hart, O. E., <i>The Drama in Modern Wales</i>	238
Heller, O., <i>Faust and Faustus</i>	499
Karsten, T. E., <i>Les anciens Germains</i>	499
Kellner, L., <i>Erläuterungen zu vierzehn Dramen Shakespeares</i>	364
Latham, M. W., <i>Elizabethan Fairies</i>	363
Lindabury, R. V., <i>Patriotism in the Elizabethan Drama</i>	234
Lockhart, J. G., <i>Literary Criticism</i> , ed. by M. C. Hildyard	237
Lote, R., <i>Explication de la littérature allemande</i>	366
Lowe, J. L., <i>The Art of Chaucer</i>	114
Massinger, Ph., <i>The Roman Actor</i> , ed. by W. L. Sandidge	236
<i>Mittelniederdeutsche Fastnachtspiele</i> , herausg. von W. Seelmann	241
<i>Nibelungenlied, Das</i> , ed. by M. Diez	241
Nordling, A., <i>De första Germanerna</i>	498
Norman, F., and H. Rohl, <i>Wörterbuch zur deutschen Literatur</i>	370
Oras, A., <i>Milton's Editors and Commentators</i>	364
Parry, J. J., <i>Bibliography of Arthurian Literature, 1922-9</i>	238
Pedersen, H., <i>Linguistic Science in the 19th Century</i>	498
<i>Plutarch's Quyeté of Mynde</i> , transl. by T. Wyat, Facsimile	715
Rabelais, F., <i>Tiers Livre</i> , éd. par A. Lefranc	239
Roberts, M., <i>Henry James's Criticism</i>	237
Russer, W. S., <i>De germaansche Klankverschuiving</i>	499
Salomon, L. B., <i>The Rebellious Lover in English Poetry</i>	497
Sasaki, T., <i>The Language of R. Bridges' Poetry</i>	115
Scott, F. N., <i>Anniversary Papers</i>	370
<i>Shakespeare's Hamlet, First Quarto, Facsimile</i>	115
Spell, J. R., <i>Life of J. J. Fernández de Lizardi</i>	497
Spurgeon, C., <i>Leading Motives in Shakespeare's Imagery</i>	235
<i>Studies in English Literature</i> , Western Reserve University	234
<i>Tentative Bibliographies of South and Central American Literatures</i> , ed. by J. D. M. Ford	368
Thomas of Britain, <i>Tristan and Ysolt</i> , transl. by R. S. Loomis	365
Weisweiler, J., <i>Busse</i>	369
<i>Year's Work in English Studies, The</i> , ed. by F. S. Boas	112
<i>Year's Work in Modern Language Studies, The</i> , ed. by W. J. Entwistle	496

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE LINEAGE OF 'THE EXTASIE'

DONNE's *Extasie* is so difficult a poem that we ought, perhaps, to welcome all critical disagreement about it and to be wary of any attempt to establish an orthodox interpretation. The orthodox interpretation I take to be that of Professor Grierson, in his notes on the text, which Signor Mario Praz corroborates, and which Mr Hugh I'A. Fausset has adopted with his peculiar 'psychological' refraction of the facts. Mr Fausset sees in the poem both the whole history of Donne's passion and also a disgusted revolt against the jejune Platonism of the Elizabethan love-lyrists—a valiant philosophy of justice to the flesh as well as to the spirit which Donne 'had now wrested from the particular experience of love and was to repeat in the wider sphere of religion.' And he quotes appositely from the sermons:

Our nature is meteoric, we respect (because we partake so) both earth and heaven; for as our bodies glorified shall be capable of spiritual joy, so our souls demerged into those bodies are allowed to take earthly pleasure. Our soul is not sent hither, only to go back again: we have some errand to do here; nor is it sent into prison because it comes innocent, and He which sent it is just¹.

Professor Grierson, it will be remembered, says simply that *The Extasie* 'is one of the most important of the lyrics as a statement of Donne's metaphysic of love, of the interconnexion and mutual dependence of body and soul².' He then quotes briefly from Plotinus' account of the ecstatic experience in the *Sixth Ennead*, ix, 11, in the French translation of Bouillet, as an abandonment of self, a perfect quietude, a desire of contact, in short a wish to merge oneself in that which one contemplates in the Sanctuary³. Finally, he cites a letter to Sir Thomas Lucy in which Donne spoke of serious letter-writing as 'a kind of extasie, and a departing, and secession, and suspension of the soul, which doth then communicate itself to two bodies.'

The difference between Professor Grierson and Mr Fausset lies in the suggestion of the former that the central thought of *The Extasie*, and

¹ John Donne. *A Study in Discord*, London, 1924, pp. 115-16.

² *The Poems of John Donne*, edited by H. J. C. Grierson, London, 1912, p. 41.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

indeed the distinct emotion expressed by the poem, was felt by the poet as traditional and as rooted in neo-Platonism; contrasted with the latter's vigorous assertion that Donne was consciously throwing off the shackles of the 'Platonism by which gentler spirits had sought to escape from savagery into some transcendental region of pure idea¹.' Mr Fausset's thin edge of heresy has lately been driven deep by M. Pierre Legouis with his attractive theory—for which he acknowledges that Rupert Brooke was in some degree responsible—that the poem is dramatic in every sense of the word, that it is rooted in the widespread dramatic impulse which produced *Measure for Measure* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, and that it objectively studies 'a couple who have been playing with Platonic love, sincerely enough on the woman's part, and imagines how they would pass from it to carnal enjoyment².' M. Legouis reasons speciously that Professor Grierson takes the poem too seriously by reading into it a confession of Donne's faith and experience, but he himself takes it no less seriously as a dramatic monologue.

The evidence which I have to present in favour of Professor Grierson's conception of the poem disposes, I believe, once and for all of Mr Fausset's minor heresy that *The Extasie* was felt by its author as a revolt against 'Platonism.' It also raises a presumption—as against M. Legouis—that we owe *The Extasie* to the stream of tradition rather than to an original dramatic impulse on Donne's part. Its drama appears to be merely the dramatisation of a conflict and reconciliation of ideas which had long been familiar in Italy and France, if not in England³.

Few Englishmen of Donne's time whose knowledge of continental neo-Platonism went beyond the Petrarchanism of the sonneteers, can have failed at least to hear of Antoine Héroët, and some of them must have read one of the many editions of *La Parfaicte Amye*, the poem which, in 1542, began the *Querelle des Femmes* to which belongs *Le Tiers Livre des Faicts et Dicts Heroïques du bon Pantagruel*. Héroët is remembered for the idealism of the last two of the three books which compose his poem, and indeed his indebtedness to Plato, as Plato was understood by the Florentine Academy, is everywhere apparent, but the realism of Jean de Meung was also well within his grasp and it is quite possible that he read Rabelais' *Tiers Livre* with appreciation. Several passages in *La Parfaicte Amye* recall Donne's *Songs*—one in particular is a perfect rendering, *à rebours*

¹ Fausset, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

² P. Legouis, *Donne the Craftsman*, Paris, 1928, pp. 68–9.

³ See M. Praz, *Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra* (p. 27). A faint parallel is quoted (p. 103) between *The Extasie* and Dante's *Vita Nuova*.

of *The Indifferent*—and in the closing passage the theme of *The Extasie* is treated in a way which cannot fail to suggest comparison:

Or s'il advient quelque foyz en la vie
Que, l'ame estant en tel estat ravie,
Les corps voisins comme morts delaisés,
D'amour et non d'autre chose pressés,
Sans y penser se mettent à leur ayse,
Que la main touche, ou que la bouche baise,
Cela n'est pas pour deshonneur compté;
C'est ung instinct de naïve bonté,
Si, ce pendant que les maistres jouyssent,
Les corps qui sont serviteurs s'esjouyssent;
Et quand des deux la jouyssance advient,
Prins le plaisir, plus ne leur en souvient.
Ny les esprits scauroyent estre records
De ce qu'ont faict en absence les corps;
Ny le corps scait, ny langue signifie
L'heur, qui l'esprit en terre deifie¹.

It would, of course, be absurd to suggest that Héroët's poem was a 'source' upon which Donne drew, either directly or indirectly, for *The Extasie*. Such a suggestion is wide of my purpose. It is enough to observe that the theme of *The Extasie* had been used conspicuously in France by a Platonising love poet some sixty years before Donne wrote his song. Héroët's editor, M. Ferdinand Gohin, does not fail to point out that the passage quoted above was paraphrased from the translation of Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* made by Jaques Colin d'Auxerre (in 1537), and even a glance at the rendering of it in Hoby's English will leave no doubt on that score. The thought in the speech which Castiglione put into the mouth of Cardinal Bembo is less hardy than Donne's, but the question raised and the answer given are essentially the same.

Therefore the woman to please her good lover [wrote Hoby], beside the graunting him mery countenances, familiar and secret talke, jeasting, dalyng, hand in hand, may also lawfully and without blame come to kissing... For since a kisse is a knitting together both of bodie and soule, it is to bee feared, lest the sensuall lover will be more enclined to the part of the bodie, than of the soule: but the reasonable lover woteth well, that although the mouth be a parcell of the bodie, yet is it an issue for the wordes, that be the interpreters of the soule, and for the inward breath, which is also called the soule.

And therefore hath a delite to joyne his mouth with the womans beloved with a kisse: not to stirre him to any dishonest desire, but because hee feeleth that that bonde is the opening of an entrie to the soules, which drawne with a coveting the one of the other, poure themselves by turne the one into the others bodie, and bee mingled so together, that each of them hath two soules.

And one alone so framed of them both ruleth (in a manner) two bodies².

¹ Antoine Héroët, *Œuvres Poétiques*. Édition critique publiée par Ferdinand Gohin, Paris, 1909, pp. 33-4, ll. 593-608.

² *The Book of the Courtier*, by Count Baldassare Castiglione, done into English by Sir Thomas Hoby (*Everyman Library*), p. 315.

A much more striking assertion of the rights of the flesh by a doctor of the Platonic school is found in the *Lezioni sopra alcune quistioni d' amore* of Benedetto Varchi, who spoke with even more authority in Italy than Castiglione himself. In discussing the question 'Se nell' amore onesto si sentono passioni,' Varchi declared for the flesh quite as boldly as did Donne. Varchi's character and career had more than one trait in common with Donne's and his doctrine was born of experience which, though it was more obscure and less defensible than Donne's, yet, like his, left its mark in all that Varchi wrote¹. Liberal as the thought in the following passage may seem, and strongly influenced though it may have been by Varchi's personal predilections, it must yet have remained within the limits of contemporary good taste and morality, for it was read publicly in the Florentine Academy. Compared with it *The Extasie* looks to be quite orthodox Platonic love. Its closing sentence is an illuminating commentary upon the line

Else a great Prince in prison lies,

and on the same conceit and the same use of the word 'Prince' in *The Anniversarie* and in *The Sunne Rising*. After quoting several passages from the *Canzoniere* in which Petrarch refers to sensual solicitation as a thorn in the flesh, Varchi proceeds:

Da questi esempi ed infiniti altri, che da tutti i poeti di tutte le lingue addurre si potrebbero, mossi alcuni, anzi spaventati dimandano, se ciò procede solamente nell' amor volgare, o pur ancora nel celeste. Alla qual dubitazione volendo risolutamente rispondere, bisognerebbe far di nuovo la divisione d' amore; perciocchè se volemo naturalmente e da veri filosofi favellare, egli si può, dell' amore, che alle donne si porta intendendo, amare onestamente e virtuosamente, e desiderare di congiungersi con la cosa amata; anzi è impossibile, che nell' amore umano, ciò è, quando alcun uomo ama alcuna donna ancora di buono amore, che cotale amore sia perfetto, se non si congiungano ancora i corpi. Perchè tutto il composto, ciò è la forma e la materia ed in somma l' anima e 'l corpo sono tanto uniti mentre viviamo, che niuna cosa è più una, che essi si siano; onde come il corpo non fa nulla da sè, non essendo il fare della materia, ma della forma, così l' anima, se bene è suo proprio il fare come forma, non però si può dire, che faccia da sè cosa niuna, ma tutte insieme col corpo per la colleganza che hanno le sentimenta e tutte le potenze dell' anima insieme².

Evidence of this kind might be multiplied from the writings of other adherents of the Florentine Academy. Those who doubt the orthodoxy of such opinions may refer to Marsilio Ficino's *De Amore oratio VII* for proof that they had their roots in the warm soil of the master's pathetic defence of the love of beautiful persons as the gateway to the Platonic mystical experience. *The Extasie* can hardly have been written in

¹ See Adolfo Gaspary, *Storia della Letteratura italiana*, tradotto da Vittorio Rossi, Turin, 1900-14, vol. II, p. 164; and G. Manacorda, *Benedetto Varchi, l' uomo, il poeta, il critico, passim*.

² Benedetto Varchi, *L' Ercolano e Lezioni quattro sopra alcune quistioni d' amore*, a cura di Francesco Costèro, p. 312.

ignorance of the casuistry of the Italian neo-Platonists. Donne may not have been adept in that lore, as Lord Herbert of Cherbury evidently was in *An Ode Upon a Question Moved Whether Love Should Continue For Ever*. The direct descent of this poem from *The Extasie* (which Professor Grierson observes¹) makes it difficult not to presume that Donne was familiar with literature of the kind represented by Varchi's *Quistioni*. If his acquaintance with such literature was at all extensive he must have realised that he was dramatising a great commonplace of the casuistic idealism of the Italians. If that is true, Professor Grierson's illustration of his thought from Plotinus is sufficiently vindicated against M. Legouis' charge that it misinterprets the poem by 'too seriously' reading into it an ideal which was not an integral part of the poet's mind.

I would not be understood as pleading that *The Extasie* is a profession of faith or in any sense an expression of sympathy with neo-Platonism on Donne's part. I believe simply that the poet felt himself to be expressing an established ideal which had been actualised dramatically in his imagination and perhaps in his life. His ecstasy—as Mr George R. Elliott finely says²—takes both him and us dramatically out of the limitations of our individual selves into a realm transcending ordinary personality. That this realm was understood and possessed more commonly by Donne's contemporaries than it is by modern men, and that its laws were stated and vulgarised by the Italian neo-Platonists hardly needs proof. The special phase with which *The Extasie* is concerned, that of the communion of spirits, might be illustrated by a cloud of witnesses. The crux of the matter for us is not the existence of the Platonic conception of an ecstasy which unperplexes the paradox of finite personality, but rather the admissibility of Donne's frankly carnal poem into that realm. The evidence which has been presented would seem to justify its admission there. And instead of ranking it dramatically with *Measure for Measure* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, I should expect to find will-o'-the-wisps of light upon it in Shakespeare—if anywhere—in idyllic passages such as that in which the Shepherd describes Florizel's love for Perdita to Polixenes:

He says he loves my daughter:
I think so too; for never gaz'd the moon
Upon the water as he'll stand and read
As't were my daughter's eyes: and, to be plain,
I think there is not half a kiss to choose
Who loves another best.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

² *The Cycle of Modern Poetry*, p. 145.

MILTON'S FIRST MARRIAGE¹

THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE MARRIAGE.

It has been shown that the history of the first divorce tract suggests that Milton was married in 1642, and that any other date is incompatible with the account given by our two authorities of why and when the tract was written. If we turn now to consider the immediate circumstances of a marriage on the two dates in question, we shall find everything pointing to the same conclusion. A marriage in the circumstances of 1643 is an enigma; a marriage in the circumstances of 1642 on the other hand explains itself; and finally the accounts given by our two authorities can only be referred to these circumstances of the earlier date. I shall present the evidence in this order, dealing first with the improbabilities of a marriage in 1643.

How did Milton come to marry into a Royalist family, living just outside Oxford, in June, 1643? This puzzle, like the other one of how he came to write a divorce tract during his honeymoon, was first pointed out by Masson. The Civil War had commenced nine months before and, since the final breakdown on April 14 of the negotiations for peace, it was clear that the quarrel could only be ended by the defeat of one of the parties. Milton was an ardent parliamentarian; nor, as we know from the incident at Rome, was he given to withholding or disguising his opinions in private intercourse. The Powell family was Royalist, situated in the zone of the Royalist headquarters and with sons probably fighting for the King. At the moment the main theatre of the war was in Oxfordshire and Bucks; the headquarters of the armies were at Oxford and Thame respectively, detachments were stationed all along the London-Oxford road, and perpetual skirmishing and raiding was in progress. The various journeys in connexion with the marriage therefore would be attended by considerable difficulties and risks; added to which, Parliament had, months before, prohibited all intercourse between the two cities except by special permit. The more closely one enquires into these conditions the more difficult it becomes to believe in a marriage at this time.

I.

I shall examine first the measures taken by Parliament to control communications between London and Oxford. The original order was

¹ Concluded from *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxvi, p. 400.

made as early as December 21, 1642¹, and on the following January 16 this entry occurs in the *Commons Journals*:

Forasmuch as the Permitting of Carriers, Waggoners, and other Persons, to travel from *London* to *Oxon*, hath been, and, if it shall be still suffered, is like to be, a means unto Persons ill-affected, to hold Intelligence with the Army raised against the Parliament, the Body whereof is now residing at *Oxon*; and to supply that Army... It is therefore Ordered, by the Lords and Commons, That no Carrier, Waggoner, or other Person whatsoever, shall hereafter, without the Order of both Houses, or the Licence of His Excellency the Earl of *Essex*, travel from *London* to *Oxon*, or from *Oxon* to *London*, or carry or send any Money, Ammunition, Bills of Exchange, Letters or any other Thing whatsoever... And such Person or Persons, as shall travel or carry any Letter contrary to this *Order*, shall be apprehended and proceeded against as a Spy and Intelligencer, according to the course of War. And this Order is to be Printed, and set up at the *Old Exchange*, and other the most publick Places in the City and Suburbs of *London*, that all Persons may take notice hereof.

Similar orders recur at short intervals during the next six months in the *Journals* of both Houses, revealing their preoccupation with the matter; the Commons in particular, who issued far fewer passes than the Lords, were doing their utmost to tighten up the regulations and increase the vigilance of the guards. Even in the Parliament's proposals for an armistice, delivered to the King on March 1, the second article laid down that the restrictions on all travellers should continue to be enforced 'as if no cessation were agreed on at all.' The King consented

as far as it concerned all officers and soldiers of the army; but he proposed that all other his subjects... might, during the cessation, pass to and from the cities of Oxford or London, ... without a pass or safe conduct².

Although the King apparently found it expedient to attempt to maintain free communications, it is doubtful in view of the vigorous parliamentary policy whether travellers, more particularly those of dubious political sentiment, would be safer from his troops than from those of the enemy. In fact, on March 20, Parliament, with superb impudence, complained to the King that, although he 'hath lately given Public Assurance, by His Proclamation,' that all his subjects should trade without let or hindrance, certain carriers had been robbed by his soldiers; and they prayed 'Restitution and Punishment of those who have presumed to violate His Majesty's Word, so publicly given³.' Finally, on July 17, 1643, the King also issued an order that no person was to go to London without due licence⁴.

Between December 21, 1642, and November 1, 1643, there are 71 orders for passes between Oxford (or Oxfordshire) and London recorded in the

¹ *Commons Journals*.

² *Clarendon* (1888 ed.), II, p. 503.

³ *Lords and Commons Journals*.

⁴ *Rushworth's Historical Collections* (1708), v, p. 130.

Commons Journals, and 276 in the *Lords Journals*. The reasons for granting the passes are various and comprehensive: for state business, ambassadors and their servants, diplomatic letters; for business men with suits to the King; for wives to rejoin husbands, relatives to visit prisoners, and for persons to return to their houses either in London or the country; for medical reasons and funerals; for two persons suffering from the King's Evil; to solicit the King's pardon for a man found guilty of manslaughter; for exchange of prisoners; for an Oxford fellow to return to his college, and a Westminster scholar to take up residence in the university; for all kinds of servants and officials of the Court, such as the King's physicians, the King's wax-chandler 'to carry lights to Oxford,' and Officers of the Wardrobe 'about the Maundy.' A great number of the passes are for servants of private individuals with letters, or clothes and personal effects, or 'household stuffs and other necessaries for domestical use.'

Every precaution is taken against the passes being misused. They are issued only for specific journeys—apart from a few exceptional cases—and only for the persons named therein. The names and qualities of all servants and attendants, and the number of horses, have to be stated; and all luggage and letters are first examined and sealed. On June 29, for instance, Lord Murray is granted a pass 'to send a Servant to *Oxon* with a Letter, upon the Occasion of the Death of Lady *Roxborough*; the which Letter is to be first seen by Mr Speaker; and my Lord undertakes that the said Servant shall carry no other Letter or Message.' With what care and strictness Parliament enforced their regulations is shown by the fact that they provided even their own emissaries with the necessary permits; and it is evident from the entries in the *Journals* that this was done not merely for their protection. For instance, the commissioners appointed by the two Houses from among their own members to treat with the King are provided with passes to Oxford, and are enjoined 'not to take any with them, but those that are their own servants,' and not to carry with them either money or jewels; and if it shall be found necessary for them to consult with Parliament in the course of the negotiations, a pass will be sent to a selected member to return to London.

It is, of course, true that, despite these precautions, unauthorised persons continued to journey between Oxford and London, as fairly frequent entries in the *Journals* would alone suffice to show:

8 July. Ordered, That the Servants of the Lady *D'Aubigny*, and the Duke of *Richmond*, taken going to *Oxon*, by Scouts from *Windsore*, be examined before the Committee of Examinations. . . . Mr *Gibbons*, sent up by Col. *Morley*, taken as he came from *Oxford*, shall be forthwith committed to the Custody of the Serjeant.

Similarly the reports on intercepted letters are part of the routine business of Parliament:

5 June. Divers Letters, intercepted at *Wicomb*, sent from *Oxon* to the Lady *Spencer*; and three Letters from Sir *William Parsons*; were all this Day read.

Perhaps more unlicensed travellers got through than were caught; nevertheless it must have been a difficult and hazardous job—not undertaken without good reason—to run the gauntlet of the garrisons and troops strung out along the road between Oxford and London. Clarendon, speaking of communications between Oxford and the North in April, 1643, says:

The enemy was much superior in all the counties between that county (Yorkshire) and Oxford, and had planted many garrisons so near all the roads that the most private messengers travelled with great hazard, three being intercepted for one that escaped¹.

This observation would have applied even more strongly to the route between Oxford and London; while to enter or leave London itself must have been most difficult of all. Orders for the more effective defence of the city are frequent in the parliamentary *Journals*. As early as October 15, 1642, an order appears in the *Lords Journals* that courts of guards, posts, bars and chains are to be set up in the suburbs, and that guards are to be posted day and night to stay all suspicious persons. On February 23, 1643, 'the Common Council passed an Act for the defence of the City by a line of redoubts and fortifications, which were taken in hand and executed without delay².' On March 7 an ordinance was passed by Parliament that the Lord Mayor and citizens of London 'shall have power to trench and stop all High-ways and By-ways leading into the City, as well within as without the Liberties, as they shall see Cause,' and to fortify them with outworks³. Thus 'all the passages and ways leading to the city were shut up, except those entering at Charing Cross, St Giles's in the Fields, St John Street, Shoreditch and Whitechapel. The ends of these streets were fortified with breastworks and turnpikes, musket proof⁴.'

It appears unlikely then that anyone, except an enemy agent or a dealer in contraband goods, would attempt the journey between London and Oxford without a pass. A person going on such purely private business as Milton's would not gratuitously add to the already considerable risks of the journey; and it is clear from the passes actually issued that he could have obtained those necessary for the marriage journeys, except perhaps in the case of his wife's relations. Altogether some half-dozen or

¹ *History* (1888), III, p. 19.

² Sir W. Besant, *London in the Time of the Stuarts*, London, 1904, p. 43.

³ *Parliamentary Journals*.

⁴ Ch. Knight, *London*, London, 1841-44, II, p. 103.

more passes would have been required: one for his own journey to Foresthill, another to bring back Mary and her relations, another for Mary to return to Foresthill, and one each for the several letters and for the messenger sent down in the autumn. But, among the 350 orders for passes in the parliamentary *Journals* up to November, 1643, there is no mention of any pass granted to either Milton or the Powells. So far as the evidence goes, those journeys were not made in 1643 at all.

II.

If we consider next the military events, and, more particularly, what was happening in the region between London and Oxford, we shall find the conditions hardly less decisive evidence against those journeys. Even armed with a pass, the traveller was not safe from the soldiery and the other dangers of a country in the throes of a Civil War. In the parliamentary *Journals* there are many references to plundering, authorised and unauthorised: complaints from those whose goods and persons have not been saved from the Parliament's soldiers by the Parliament's warrant, orders to return goods and cattle taken from the wrong people, and other orders granting protection against routine pillage and molestation. Both armies had to spoil the country for money, provisions, horses and all supplies; it was inevitable that undisciplined troops whose pay was chronically in arrears should better the example and plunder on their own account. Baxter tells us that after the battle of Edgehill he retired to Coventry, a Puritan stronghold, because 'soldiers of one side or other would be frequently among us, and we must still be at the mercy of every furious Beast that would make a prey of us¹.' Colonel Goodwin, in command of the parliamentary garrison at Aylesbury, writes: 'We are all most abominable plunderers, as bad as Prince Robert. . . . I am ashamed to look an honest man in the face².' The Verney family's letters are full of references to the fear of plundering soldiers. Mrs Isham writes from Hillesden in Bucks complaining that she has to entertain soldiers 'twice a day and keepe them company all the while for feare they should not think us courteous. . . . For the passengers that pass aboute ther bisnes, they lay hold on them³.' The *Mercurius Aulicus* for May 3, 1643, states: 'This day came news that *Bulmore* one of the *Scoutemasters* of the *Rebels Army*, (a fellow that had robbed more Passengers, rifled more Carriers, and intercepted more letters, than all the villaines in the pack) was killed

¹ *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), p. 43.

² C. D. Whetham, *Col. Nathaniel Whetham*, p. 41: quoted from Carte MS., Bod. Lib. 103, f. 91.

³ *Verney Memoirs*, II, p. 157.

at Whateley by a Gentleman in His Majesties Service.' More to be dreaded, perhaps, than the soldiers were the private marauders, often masquerading as soldiers, who took advantage of the prevailing lawlessness. On December 1, 1643, the King issued a proclamation commanding constables and other officers of every town and parish to examine strictly all persons pretending to be soldiers, 'and if he either finde they have robbed or taken away any Horses, Cattell or other Goods from any of His Subjects without authority,' and cannot produce an authentic pass under the hand of one of their officers, they are to be delivered over to the nearest garrison¹. Possibly the victims did prefer to be robbed with authority.

These conditions were naturally at their worst in the region between Oxford and London. In Oxford the King maintained a large force always ready to raid the surrounding country or to threaten an advance on London. Even when the main operations were elsewhere, constant skirmishing was occurring in this part, more especially whenever Prince Rupert was at Oxford; any morning his troopers might descend on an isolated detachment of Roundheads, plundering the unfortunate town or village. But the one period during the whole war when things were most active in this area was the early summer of 1643.

Reading had surrendered to the parliamentary forces on April 27, thus freeing their main army for an advance. Six weeks later Essex marched towards Oxford; 'but in truth,' says Clarendon, 'rather to secure Buckinghamshire, which was now infested by the King's horse, than to disquiet that place².' In consequence of this advance, says Anthony Wood, 'his majesties leaguer removed from Abyngton warde, and was drawn to Bullington greene, and quartered in the villages thereabouts³.' Bullington Green was on the east of Oxford, under the south side of Shotover Hill; Foresthill was in the hundred of Bullington. Essex took up his headquarters at Thame on June 10. On June 13 he sent an advanced guard to Wheatley, to keep in touch with the royalist post on Shotover Hill: the Powells' house, standing a little aside from the main Oxford road, was about a mile from both these places. On June 17 a force of 2500 troopers, sent by Essex to capture Islip, would pass through Foresthill, which lies just along the road from Wheatley to Islip. On the same day Prince Rupert rode out of Oxford with 1700 men; his raid proceeded down the Wheatley-London road through Tetsworth and Postcombe to Chinnor, taking the garrisons of these places by surprise, and concluded with the fight at Chalgrove Field the next day. On June 25 the royalist cavalry

¹ *Merc. Aul.*, Dec. 3, 1643.

² *Op. cit.*, III, p. 53.

³ *Life and Times*, I, p. 100.

under Colonel Hurry again swept round the rear of Essex's army, defeated Stapleton's horse and plundered Wycombe¹.

Now, according to the accepted dating, Milton went to Foresthill about May 21 and returned with his wife, accompanied by some of her relations, about June 21: their route lay along the Wheatley-London road through Tetsworth, Postcombe and Wycombe².

So great was the alarm in consequence of these royalist raids 'that in London itself a rumour spread that the city was in danger. From all parts men ran hastily to their posts on the line of defence³.' The extent of the alarm in London is partly to be explained by recent happenings there. On May 22 the first hint was obtained of a royalist conspiracy, engineered from Oxford and known as Waller's plot. The intention had been to organise the numerous royalists in London, seize the defences of the city and open the gates to the King's forces; thus it was hoped to end the war at one blow. The commission of array, issued by Charles to lend an air of legality to the design, had been brought to London by Lady Daubigny after a visit made to Oxford with a parliamentary pass. The indignation and fear aroused by the discovery of this plot, aggravated by the news that Charles had entered into negotiations with the papist rebels in Ireland, provided Pym with the psychological moment he wanted to impose a vow or covenant as a test of active loyalty to the cause of Parliament against the King. The covenant, having been signed by the members of both Houses, was sent forth to be signed by the public; June 15 was observed as a day of thanksgiving for deliverance from the recent peril, when the covenant was freely taken in the city. Following on these events, the failure of Essex's army to contain the royalist forces at Oxford, together with the success of the royalist arms in the north and west, might well raise doubts of the safety of London and create a panic there. On July 19 the Commons ordered 'That the Committee of the Militia of the City of *London* shall appoint persons to search, in every parish within the Works, together with the Constables, for suspected royalists, and also for those suspected to pass to and from Oxford, or any of the King's Forces, without licence⁴.'

It was at this moment of special excitement and vigilance that Milton is supposed to have arrived with his royalist bride and her relations, coming without passes from the vicinity of Oxford.

¹ See Gardiner's *Civil War*, I, pp. 153-4.

² The fact that travellers on horseback might strike across country does not seriously affect the argument.

³ Gardiner, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 156. This paragraph is based on Chaps. vii and viii.

⁴ *Commons Journals*.

III.

Is it credible that the marriage journeys were accomplished under these conditions? Is it likely that Milton would consent to his young wife's facing the return journey alone? With regard to Milton's initial journey to Foresthill, which is the crucial point, it may be contended that people, as one would expect and as there is evidence to show, went about their necessary business much as usual, and that Milton, who was not without courage and resolution, might do likewise; but it would surely have to be 'necessary business' and no mere 'Journey of Recreation' such as Phillips tells us those about him supposed Milton's journey to be. This in fact brings us to the last section of the puzzle, involving a consideration of the circumstances in 1642, before we turn finally to examine in the light of the facts what our two authorities have to say on the matter.

It will at least be agreed that, if Milton went that journey in 1643, he must have been acting on strong motives and with a definite object. So far as our knowledge goes there are two possible motives: he may have gone to propose for Mary Powell's hand or he may have gone to discuss money matters with her father. Whether Milton might suddenly bethink himself of Mary Powell and decide to marry into a royalist family in May, 1643, must be left to the individual fancy; but it is certainly more credible in May, 1642, before the fighting began or Royalist and Roundhead existed. In the latter case his misalliance with a royalist becomes a trick of fate, a tale of 'life's little ironies.' We know that the question of marriage had already been occupying his thoughts in the spring of 1642, when he told the world that he would 'choose a virgin of mean fortunes, honestly bred, before the wealthiest widow'¹; perhaps he had Mary Powell in mind when he wrote the words. The other possibility, that he went to discuss Powell's debt to him, accords even less well with the later date. This, as we shall see, was an unpropitious moment for such an errand; it would be neither suggested nor welcomed by Powell himself, who would not just then be bothered about his debts.

Once we have got Milton to Foresthill there is no longer any problem about the marriage so far as he is concerned: one simply assumes that he was in love. From this point the problem centres in the conduct of the parents. Why did they accept Milton as a son-in-law, and why did they change their minds a month or so later? As to the latter question, all the earlier biographers stress the fact that from the outset Mary found life

¹ *Apology against a Pamphlet called A Modest Confutation* (Mch./Apl. 1642), Bohn, III, p. 151.

with Milton irksome, and no doubt her discontent was the primary cause of the desertion; but, according to the *Earliest Life*, she pleaded on her return to Milton 'that her Mother had been the inciter of her to that frowardness.' In any case her parents must have had their own reasons for acquiescing in her conduct; and those reasons must have been something stronger than the not uncommon reluctance of a young wife to live with her husband. What can have been the circumstances that made the Powells alter so quickly towards Milton? If we consider the public events of the summer of 1642 together with what we know of the private affairs of Richard Powell at that time, we shall find the only likely answer to this question.

Although by the end of May, 1642, civil war seemed imminent, and although by the end of June both sides had begun to take open and active measures to raise armies, yet the ordinary country gentleman hardly realised what was happening and saw no reason to range himself irrevocably on one side or the other. Many who were more nearly concerned did not believe that it would actually come to fighting, or imagined that if it did the issue would be decided by the first clash of arms. As late as August 28, after the raising of the royal standard, Lady Sussex reports the opinion of a captain in the King's army that 'wee shall have noe fiteinge, for the Kainge hath neither money nor men¹'; while in a letter dated from Cuddesdon near Oxford on September 5 Edmund Gardner, a captain of dragoons in the King's service, remarks: 'If in earnest we have any wars in the Kingdome (which I hope God will prevent)².' Baxter tells us that even after the battle of Edgehill, 'so wise was I, and all the Country besides, that we commonly supposed that a very few days or weeks by one other Battel, would end the Wars³.'

We need not then think of Powell in June, 1642, as an active royalist or as particularly concerned with the national crisis. What we know of him leads us to imagine that he would be the last to trouble his head with civil broils until they were brought home to his door. His thoughts would be sufficiently occupied with his own private worries, especially with the state of his finances.

IV.

Powell's financial transactions were both involved and dishonest, and it is not easy to unravel them. What is clear, however, is that by the summer of 1642 he was deeply in debt and his property not merely heavily

¹ *Verney Memoirs*, II, p. 103.

² *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, p. 43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

mortgaged but mortgaged several times over to unrelated and unsuspecting parties. The following details are taken from the *Royalist Composition Papers* as printed in W. D. Hamilton's 'Original Papers,' and from Mr D. H. Stevens's 'Mary Powell's Lost Dowry'.¹

Powell's chief property was the manor of Foresthill, held on lease and worth about £270 a year. On June 30, 1640, this was mortgaged to Sir Robert Pye for £1400, to be redeemed on payment of £1510 on July 1, 1641. Powell failed to pay on the appointed date. A year later however, on May 28, 1642, he paid £110, the interest for one year; the possible reason for this gesture will be considered presently. No further payment was made; and accordingly, in 1646, Sir Robert took possession².

Besides the Foresthill estate Powell owned two separate properties in Wheatley, one freehold and the other leased from All Souls' College at Oxford, which are usually confused together³. Both these properties were also mortgaged before the war, but matters were complicated by there being more than one claimant. We will take first the case of the freehold property, which was valued by Powell at £40 before the war and by Milton at £80 after the war⁴. It had been mortgaged in January, 1631, to Edward Ashworth for ninety-nine years for a security of £400. So much is admitted by Powell in a *Particular* of his estate dated November 21, 1646, to which he adds the note: 'A demyse for 99 years defeated by a payment of £400 the 30 of Jan. 1642; arrears unpaid.' This would seem to mean that in order to save the property from falling into Ashworth's hands, he had paid the amount of the principal but not the interest. At any rate the mortgage was still unredeemed on August 28, 1650, when Ashworth's widow petitioned to be allowed to compound for the estate, the lease of which she claimed until such time as the debt should be cleared⁵. But by this time the property was actually in the hands of Milton. According to Mrs Powell's statement it had been mortgaged to him before the war on account of the £500 owed him by Powell since 1627⁶; perhaps here is the reason why Powell had staved off Ashworth in 1642 by the unwonted measure of paying £400. At all events the property had been delivered to Milton by the Sheriff of Oxfordshire on November 20, 1647, and he compounded for it in March, 1651, by which time he states he had received from it about £180, leaving about £300 still owing⁷. It should be noted that in this calculation Milton leaves out of account the dowry of £1000 Powell had promised him with his daughter, which

¹ *Milton Papers* (Univ. of Chicago), 1927.

³ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, pp. iii and xvii.

⁵ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. xvii.

⁷ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, pp. xxxi and xxvii.

² Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. xv.

⁴ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, pp. iii and xxiv.

⁶ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. xlv.

was never paid. Apart from these mortgages, the property was still further charged with Mrs Powell's dower and with debts on bonds amounting to £1200¹. The oldest claim on Powell's estate was this in respect of his wife's dower. At the time of her marriage in 1620 an uncle had provided a dowry of £2000 under agreement that lands should be conveyed to her having a net annual value of £100; Powell had of course neglected to carry out his side of the bargain². Mrs Powell states that the dower had been paid to her out of the Wheatley property until it was extended by Milton³; after that Milton had paid her widow's thirds out of the property until the commissioners refused to allow him the amount of them in his composition fine; whereupon Mrs Powell immediately brought a suit against him, claiming that her thirds should continue to be paid out of the estate⁴. Now it was as much in the interest of Mrs Powell as of Milton that her thirds should be allowed for in the composition, since the fine was an addition to the debt to Milton that would have to be paid off before the property could revert to the Powells. Milton's action, therefore, in stopping payment of the thirds, was possibly intended to force the hands of the commissioners; in which case the language Mrs Powell used about him in the course of her suit would be merely an artifice to move their compassion.

By law she might recover her thirds without doubt, but she is so extreame poore she hath not wherewithall to prosecute, and besides, Mr. Milton is a harsh and chollericke man, and married Mrs. Powell's daughter, who would be undone if any such course were taken against him by Mrs. Powell, he having turned away his wife heretofore for a long space upon some other occasion⁵.

Probably these words no more represent her true opinion of Milton than they do the facts of the desertion, and it is the 'harsh and chollericke' commissioners she really has in mind.

The way in which Powell's freehold property in Wheatley was severally mortgaged to Ashworth and Milton, besides being charged with his wife's dower and other debts, is typical of his business methods. These dealings, in fact, were mild compared with the chicanery over his other property in Wheatley, the story of which, as unfolded in a case in the Chancellor's Court in the University of Oxford in September, 1656, has been set forth by Mr Stevens⁶. Powell took up the lease of the property from All Souls' in 1626; this was set aside for a new lease in 1634, but the voided lease was not surrendered. In 1638 he borrowed £200 from Richard Bateman on the new lease. On September 30, 1639, he borrowed £340 from George

¹ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, pp. xliv and xiii.

² Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. xliv.

³ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. 53.

⁴ Stevens, *op. cit.*

⁵ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. xxxvii.

⁶ *Op. cit.*

Hearne, assigning as security the voided lease for a term of 31 years; this lease, however, was redemised to Powell in exchange for a rental of £40 a year. In 1641 he managed to obtain yet another lease from All Souls' in exchange for the voided lease, paying a fine of £26. 13s. 4d.; this lease, of course, had no standing as against that of 1634 in the hands of Bateman, which was the only valid one. In December, 1641, he borrowed £300 from Sir Edward Powell, assigning the 1641 lease as security. According to Sir Edward's account, the assignment was to be cancelled if Richard Powell repaid the money with interest at the end of six months¹; but a new agreement seems to have been made on October 29, 1642, that Richard Powell should continue to hold the land, paying 8 per cent. on the money, while Sir Edward held the worthless mortgage. At any rate neither principal nor interest was ever paid, and accordingly Sir Edward took possession of the property in January, 1646. In 1656 the lease came within three years of its legal term and All Souls' exercised its right to renew or transfer it; the claim on the estate thereupon brought by William Powell, nephew and heir to Sir Edward², caused the warden and fellows of the college to unravel the whole story of Richard Powell's chicanery. The case closed on November 8, 1656, when the court expressed the opinion that all the circumstances had been well known to Richard Powell, who had wittingly deceived himself that he might cozen Sir Edward.

V.

From these later revelations we get a sufficient idea of the state of Powell's affairs in the summer of 1642. We can imagine the kind of calculations with which his mind was chiefly engaged; and there is one incident that gives a particular insight into what was passing there.

We have seen that, having failed to pay the money owing to Sir Robert Pye in June, 1641, he suddenly and unaccountably paid the interest for one year on May 28, 1642. Yet one would suppose him shorter of money than ever at this time. Judging from the *Verney Memoirs*, everyone was complaining of being ruined by taxes and subsidies and of the difficulty of getting in rents. In April Lady Sussex writes: 'My Essex rents I am suer will be well pade, for the have good peniworth and forfet ther leses if the pay not; I doubt Buckinghamsher rents will not be pade well.' Early in May she writes: 'I have sent up to loke after my rintes; I doubt this nues of Hull will make them pade slowly in and I must pay supsityes for all my lordes astate and myne to.' Mrs Eure writes from Yorkshire on

¹ Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. xvii.

² *Cal. of Proceedings of Comm. for Compounding*, No. 1970.

May 5, 'I hope Parliment will laye no more taxes on the countrye for rents are paid noe where'; and later, 'I have still about halfe my rents behind.'

In this state of things it is certain that Powell, who was not a good payer at the best of times, must have had cogent reasons for paying £110 to Sir Robert in the May of this year, especially after having paid £400 to Ashworth the previous January. Mr Burns Martin asks¹, 'Where did he obtain the sum? Why did he pay it *one month before* the completion of the second year of his indebtedness? Can John Milton have lent Powell the money?' If the marriage took place in 1642 this is possible. But there is a more certain conjecture to be drawn from the incident: it is clear that Powell had not realised the imminence of a Civil War, or at least had not realised its consequences. Probably the reason for paying Sir Robert was the same as the reason for paying Ashworth: his creditor pressing him, he effected a compromise by paying something. But Sir Robert Pye, M.P. for Woodstock, was a staunch Parliament man and at the outbreak of war took a commission in the parliamentary army². Three or four months later, therefore, Powell would not have considered paying this creditor anything; he would then rather be hoping that a victory for the King might free his estate from all debts to those who, in the Royal Proclamation of August 9, 1642, had been branded as traitors for taking up arms against Charles. Can we not imagine Powell regretting this money as he was to regret his daughter given to another of the 'enemy'?

This incident, in fact, enables us to form a reasonable idea of what might have been Powell's attitude towards a request by Milton for his daughter's hand in May, 1642. Here he was more concerned with his private affairs than with the national crisis, doing his best to stave off creditors; one of the creditors appears at Foresthill, whether at Powell's invitation or on his own initiative, and offers to take his eldest daughter off his hands; Powell welcomes the proposal as an immediate financial relief and as a future defence against the creditor. Twelve months later, on the contrary, the situation is completely changed: Powell's lot has been cast willy nilly with the King, the fortunes of Parliament are nearing their lowest ebb, and it must remain a mystery why he should then have accepted Milton as a son-in-law—accepted him so wholeheartedly as to throw in a dowry of £1000, even though he never meant to honour it.

¹ *Op. cit.*

² D. Masson, *Life of Milton*, II, pp. 173, 446.

VI.

When would the Powells begin to regret such a marriage made in June, 1642? Doubtless some time during August or September, as they heard of the preparations for war in Oxford. Anthony Wood, a boy in Oxford at the time, tells us that after the King had declared Essex and his officers traitors on August 9 the University 'began to put themselves in a posture of defence.' This proclamation, followed by a similar one from Parliament on August 18 denouncing as traitors all who gave assistance to the King, marked the virtual commencement of the war. On August 13 a review of arms was held in Oxford, and the scholars began to drill. On the 28th Sir John Biron arrived with a body of royalist troopers, and an attempt was made to fortify the city; on September 10 he rode away to the King's army, accompanied by about a hundred scholars as volunteers, among whom may have been Powell's second son, who had matriculated at the University in May, 1640. On the 12th parliamentary troops from Aylesbury entered the city; between then and October 3 there was a continual coming and going of parliamentary troops, after which the town 'was pretty well quitted of any more intercourse of soldiers... and the Universitie being disarmed by the Lord Saye, our townsmen began to fortifie the towne... to keepe out... the kinge's forces¹.' The excitement of these happenings was reflected in the countryside. Cary Gardiner writes from Cuddesdon on September 12:

I am in a great dill of vexation for pure Oxford, for this day ther is 12 hondored solgars com ther... what cannot be billeted in the tounes at Oxford is sent tu all the tounes about. Wee look for thim sodenly in hopp thay will bee betar thin ther promyses, for if thay ar not, the gentell men of the contary will have litell left².

The Powells would be watching events with similar trepidation.

During these weeks of uncertainty, with the marching and counter-marching of royalist and parliamentary troops, Powell, whichever side his sympathies inclined to, may prudently have held himself neutral, waiting to see which way the cat would jump; and he may have agreed with his wife that Mary need not return to her husband until the course of events was clearer. If Parliament proved victorious, Mary's failure to return or to answer letters could be explained by the disturbed state of the country; and by the time Milton sent down the messenger 'who was dismissed with some sort of Contempt,' which could not have been before late October, the Powells would be no longer in doubt.

It was after the battle of Edgehill on October 23 that people in general realised that a Civil War was actually in progress, that the issue was to

¹ Wood's *Life and Times*, I, p. 67.

² *Verney Memoirs*, II, p. 67.

be decided by the sword, and that it was necessary to side definitely either for or against the King. Thomas May says that after Edgehill

the greatest Gentlemen of divers Counties began then to consider of the King, as of one that, in possibility, might prove a Conqueror against the Parliament; and many of them, who before, as Neuters, had stood at gaze, in hope that one quick blow might clear the doubt, and save them the danger of declaring themselves, came now in, and readily adhered to that side on which there seemed least feares and greatest hopes, which was the King's Party. For, on the Parliament-side, the encouragements were only of a publike kind, and nothing promised but the free enjoyment of their native Liberty; no particular honours, preferments, or Estates of Enemies; and, on the other hand, no such total ruine could be threatened from a victorious Parliament, (being a body, as it were, of the people themselves,) as from an incensed Prince, and such hungry followers as usually go along with Princes in those waies¹.

This is, of course, a partisan statement, and the view that Royalists had nothing to fear from a victorious Parliament was to be belied in the event; nevertheless, it probably represents the attitude of such neutral gentry at the time, and indicates what one imagines to have been the course steered by Powell. Whatever he thought of the chances of the combatants and the merits of their causes, his situation left him no alternative but to throw in his lot with the King after Charles had entered Oxford on October 29, and Rupert had begun to plunder the neighbouring estates of all who were not professed Royalists. Powell's conduct in these circumstances is clearly and briefly explained in his petition to the Commissioners for Compositions after the war: 'Your petitioners estate, for the most parte lying in the King's quarters, he did adhere to his Majesty's party against the forces raised by the Parliament².'

VII.

Such are the circumstances for the two years in question. At every turn we find the facts pointing away from 1643 and toward the previous year. The case can be summarised in the following form. (1) The difficulties and dangers of the journeys in 1643, for which no passes appear to have been obtained, and our ignorance of any sufficient motive for the initial journey: these objections do not apply to 1642. (2) It is intelligible that the Powells should welcome Milton in 1642, accept him as a son-in-law and regret the contract a month or so later: such conduct is inexplicable in 1643. In short, a coherent story can only be made of Milton's marriage on the assumption that it occurred in 1642.

What is more conclusive than the general probability, however, is that the story as we have attempted to reconstruct it accords with that told

¹ Thomas May, *History of the Long Parliament* (1812 ed.), p. 176.

² Hamilton, *loc. cit.*, p. 11.

by our two authorities. It remains to consider their accounts in the light of the facts. I begin with Phillips:

About *Whitsuntide* it was, or a little after, that he took a Journey into the Country: no body about him certainly knowing the Reason, or that it was any more than a Journey of Recreation: after a Month's stay, home he returns a Married-man, that went out a Batchelor; his wife being *Mary* the eldest Daughter of Mr. *Richard Powell*, then a Justice of Peace, of *Forresthill*, near *Shotover* in *Oxfordshire*; some few of her nearest Relations accompanying the Bride to her new Habitation; which by reason the Father nor any body else were yet come, was able to receive them; where the Feasting held for some days in Celebration of the Nuptials, and for entertainment of the Bride's Friends. At length they took their leave, and returning to *Forresthill*, left the Sister behind; probably not much to her satisfaction; as appeared by the Sequel; by that time she had for a Month or thereabout led a Philosophical Life (after having been used to a great House, and much Company and Joviality) Her Friends, possibly incited by her own desire, made earnest suit by Letter, to have her Company the remaining part of the Summer, which was granted, on condition of her return at the time appointed, *Michalemas*, or thereabout.

The first obvious comment on this passage is that, if Milton had gone his journey in May, 1643, it would hardly have been mistaken for a holiday jaunt; Phillips conveys the impression that all these journeys and junketings were inspired by a lightheartedness more consonant with the months prior to the outbreak of the war. Is there not significance also in the phrase '*then* a Justice of Peace'? One would further suppose that Milton's fetching home a royalist bride and her relatives from the neighbourhood of Oxford at this moment of crisis in London would occasion surprise and comment and be altogether a memorable thing; yet Phillips recalls nothing unusual in the event beyond its abruptness. Nor is this last point a mere argument from negative evidence: Phillips had not overlooked the fact that the Powells were Royalists from the vicinity of Oxford, since he mentions it just afterwards as the reason for the desertion. Yet, if this was the reason for the desertion in October, it was an equally cogent reason against the marriage in June; and one would expect Phillips to have remarked upon it, and to have given it as an additional reason why Mary was uncomfortable in Aldersgate Street. The implication is that the Powells had become Royalist in the meantime, which would almost certainly be during the summer of 1642. Were it not for the refusal to believe what Phillips says rather than what others say he says, there would be no need to labour this point; for in fact he tells us plainly that the desertion occurred in the autumn of 1642.

Michalemas being come, and no news of his Wife's return, he sent for her by Letter, and receiving no answer, sent several other Letters, which were also unanswered; so that at last he dispatch'd down a Foot-Messenger with a Letter, desiring her return; but the Messenger came back not only without an answer, at least a satisfactory one, but to the best of my remembrance, reported that he was dismissed with some sort of Contempt; this proceeding, in all probability, was grounded upon no other Cause but this, namely, That the Family being generally addicted to the Cavalier Party, as they

called it, and some of them possibly ingaged in the King's Service, who by this time had his Head Quarters at *Oxford*, and was in some Prospect of Success, they began to repent them of having Matched the Eldest Daughter of the Family to a Person so contrary to them in Opinion; and thought it would be a blot in their Escutcheon, when ever that Court should come to Flourish again.

The words 'by this time' give a definite and decisive date; and the whole of this account agrees exactly with the one we have already deduced from the circumstances.

VIII.

The *Earliest Life* confirms our argument from the difficulties of communication in 1643 in a similar way to that in which Phillips confirms our argument from the conduct of the Powells. This biographer, like Phillips, is silent about any difficulties and risks of the marriage journeys, but immediately afterwards states that the nearness of the Powells' house to Oxford prevented all communication between Milton and his wife after the desertion. Here again it is implied that a new situation had arisen between the summer and the autumn such as could only have occurred in 1642. And here again the date is settled by reference to a historical event.

In this while, his manner of Settlement fitting him for the reception of a Wife, hee in a moneth's time (according to his practise of not wasting that precious Talent) courted, married, and brought home from Forrest-hall near Oxford a Daughter of Mr. Powell. But shee, that was very Yong, and had bin bred in a family of plenty and freedom, being not well pleas'd with his reserv'd manner of Life, within a few days left him, and went back into the Country with her Mother: Nor though hee sent severall pressing invitations could hee prevayl with her to return, till about foure yeers after, when Oxford was surrendr'd (the nighness of her Fathers house to that Garrison having for the most part of the meantime hindred any communication between them) shee of her own accord came, and submitted to him.

Oxford surrendered June 24, 1646. It is true that our writer is mistaken in placing Mary's return as late as this, since she bore her first child to Milton in July, 1646. The decision that she should return to her husband would probably be taken after the battle of Naseby on June 14, 1645, which finally broke the royalist army; it was the remainder of the Powell family that joined her at Milton's house after the fall of Oxford. But as the occasion of both arrivals was the collapse of the royal cause it was easy to confound them; and the error in no way invalidates the implied statement that the marriage took place in 1642.

IX.

To sum up the whole argument. The traditional date is apocryphal. All the known circumstances point to 1642 and away from 1643. The

account in the *Earliest Life* requires the date 1642; the account in Phillips also requires 1642, though containing one statement that may be read as inconsistent with it. There seems no excuse for any longer perpetuating Toland's error.

That the correction of this error is of no trivial importance to students of Milton has, I hope, been made evident in the course of the argument. For one thing it brings the marriage into proper relation to the development of his ideas as traced by Mr J. H. Hanford¹. But what seems to me no less important is that it puts Milton's character in a fairer light. We get a story of the marriage in which Milton shows, not as both knave and fool, but as a victim of events who was to prove magnanimous in forgiving and helping those responsible for the indignity and suffering he had to endure. Above all, the new date disposes of that grotesque legend of the writing of the first divorce tract. There are many such scandals about the 'puritan poet' which the world, suspicious and prejudiced, has been too ready first to believe and then to judge him by: he lied vaingloriously about the date of his return from Italy and about meeting Galileo there, dissembled the politic or sinister motives behind his pamphlets, fraudulently inserted a prayer into the *Eikon Basilike* in order to abuse the dead king, dealt harshly with his mother-in-law and bullied his daughters. From such stories derives the common idea of Milton: as J. S. Smart used to say, anyone would think the man to have been a kind of ogre—and a ludicrous kind at that. But the most notorious of these scandals, giving colour and warrant to the rest, is that of the first divorce tract: its refutation should make us wary of the others, check the industry in inventing fresh ones, and help us to recover a portrait of the man less at variance with the testimony of those who knew and respected him.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

¹ 'Chronology of Milton's Private Studies' (*Publ. of Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, XXXII, 1921).

SHAKESPEARE'S VENICE

SHAKESPEARE'S many accurate allusions to Venice are generally accounted for as a manifestation of the intuitive knowledge peculiar to a poetic mind, which, without possessing more than meagre indications about a subject, can yet reconstruct an imaginative picture corresponding faithfully to reality. Certain commentators suggest that Giovanni Florio, or other Italians resident in London, supplied him with detailed information about Italy. Very rarely is the theory countenanced that he may have been one of the numerous travellers of the Elizabethan age who visited Italy.

However that may be, the astonishing fact remains: Shakespeare knew Venice better and more minutely than some of his critics have done, or how otherwise could the 'Sagittary' of *Othello* have remained so long unidentified¹? It can, I think, be shown that the 'Sagittary' did actually exist, and does actually exist, and can still be seen in Venice to-day.

It is generally interpreted as the name of an inn. In the accounts left by Renaissance travellers, in the itineraries of pilgrims, whose normal route to Palestine was by land as far as Venice, there are abundant records of inns in all quarters of the town. Frequent mention is made of the *Albergo Tedesco*, the *Leone Bianco*, and the *Cavalletto*, kept by Dutchmen or Germans, and visited by their compatriots. There was the *Serpa* or *Cerva*, preferred by ambassadors and diplomats, and the *Luna* and the *Selvadego* frequented by Frenchmen. There were less pretentious inns near Rialto: the *Specchio*, the *Campana*, the *Bo*, the *Torre*, and the *Cicogna*; while the very signpost of the *Storione* has come down to us, reproduced by Carpaccio in his *Patriarca di Grado*. Many more are known, but an inn called the 'Sagittary' has left no trace².

Theodor Elze, writing in Venice in 1878, came to the conclusion that it was an imaginary name devised by Shakespeare, and found a certain appropriateness in the choice of such an inn as the dwelling of a soldier³. But the 'Sagittary' was no inn.

Charles Knight declared it to be 'the residence at the Arsenal of the commanding officers of the navy and army of the republic. The figure of an archer with his drawn bow, still indicates the place.' It is true that the figure of an archer, bow in hand, still stands, together with seven other

¹ Act I, sc. i, 159; Act I, sc. iii, 115.

² E. Zaniboni, *Alberghi Italiani e Viaggiatori Stranieri*, 1921.

³ Theodor Elze, *Italienische Skizzen zu Shakespeare*.

statues, at the entrance to the Arsenal, but Knight's statement has no other foundation of fact.

The gateway of the Arsenal dates from 1460, and the winged lion and the statue representing Saint Giustina were placed above it to commemorate the naval victory of Lepanto in 1571. But it was not until 1682 that the stone balustrade enclosing the platform was constructed before the gateway. The eight figures stand on this balustrade. On the right is Neptune holding his trident, on the left is Mars, depicted as an archer, bow in hand, both statues being the signed work of Giovanni Comino, whose chief sculpture was executed between 1673 and 1692. The statue of the archer, Mars, did not exist in Shakespeare's time, and therefore no part of the Arsenal can possibly have derived its name from it in that period.

Moreover Knight's statement that the 'Sagittary' was the residence of the principal officers of the army and navy of the republic is incorrect. The principal officers of the Arsenal, three in number, were certainly compelled to reside within the Arsenal itself. A decree to this effect was enforced in 1442, and the three *Patroni all' Arsenal* were obliged to comply until 1486, when a modification was made¹. These officers lived in certain houses set apart for them, known as the *palazzi del Paradiso, del Purgatorio, and dell' Inferno*. Such names are said to have originated from the fact that one was well exposed to the sun, whereas the other two were in proportionate degree cold, damp and cheerless.

Othello was not one of the *Patroni all' Arsenal*, so that his dwelling would not necessarily be in or near the Arsenal. Even if it were situated in the neighbourhood, the text shows clearly that, in the opening scenes which introduce the 'Sagittary,' he was not in his usual dwelling.

You have been hotly called for,
When being not at your lodging to be found,
The Senate hath sent about three several quests,
To search you out. (Act I, sc. ii, 44.)

The 'Sagittary,' in fact, had no connexion whatsoever with the Arsenal.

In Act I, scene i, 159, Iago bids Roderigo:

Lead to the Sagittary the raised search,
And there will I be with him.

The implication is undeniable that the scene, in which Roderigo leading the search party comes upon Iago and Othello, will be set in the 'Sagittary' itself.

That scene takes place in the street outside the house to which Othello

¹ Cristoforo Tentori, *Storia di Venezia*, 1787, vi, p. 385.

has taken Desdemona: for Othello, on receiving the urgent summons from the Senate, replies (Act I, sc. ii, 48):

I will but spend a word here in the house,
And go with you.

The 'Sagittary,' then, is a street in Venice: and when Othello urges the Duke:

Send for the lady to the Sagittary,

and to Iago adds the command (Act I, sc. iii, 121):

Ancient, conduct them:
You best know the place,

he is bidding Iago conduct them to the particular house in the 'Sagittary' where Desdemona is to be found. They would all know the street, but Iago's mission is to lead them to the precise house which he alone knows.

Nor is this identification of the 'Sagittary' with a street in Venice mere conjecture. Records show that the street existed in the thirteenth century. Marin Sanuto noted in his diary that a fire broke out there during the night of July 12, 1518, causing great damage. The street was a busy thoroughfare in Shakespeare's time, and Giacomo Franco, the celebrated engraver, had his shop there at the sign of the Sun. In this street Byron lodged when he first visited Venice in November, 1816, and here he fell in love with the wife of his landlord, Marianna Segati. The street is still to be seen in Venice, and the thought is pleasant that it will still exist so long as the city stands.

For the 'Sagittary' is one of the most characteristic *calli* of Venice. It is none other than the *Frezzaria*, a narrow dark street which runs from the Salizzada San Moisè just off Piazza San Marco, takes a right-angle turn, and ends on the Ponte dei Barcaroli near Campo San Fantino. The *Frezzaria* was so called because the makers of arrows had their shops there. In 1271 the guild of smiths was divided up into distinct and specialised groups, arrow-makers, armourers, sword-makers, cutlers, makers of scabbards and smiths proper, and their workshops gave their names to various streets in the city. Such nomenclature was common in Venice. Hence *Spadaria*, *Merceria*, *Cordaria* and *Casselaria* which still exist to-day.

Shakespeare's manner of adopting the name of the street is of peculiar interest. Florio translates '*Frezzaria* or *Frecciarìa*' as 'a place where shafts or arrows are made, kept or sold,' but he makes no reference to the street of that name in Venice.

It must be clearly understood that the 'Sagittary' of *Othello* is in no way connected with the zodiacal constellation Sagittarius: nor with the

Centaur, the Sagittary referred to in *Troilus and Cressida*. It is not the same word at all, but an entirely new word, coined by Shakespeare; concocted, moreover, with singular penetration into the formation of Venetian street names. *Sagittary* was formed by analogy with *Frezzaria*. The two words are identical in construction and meaning. In Shakespeare's time the word arrow could be expressed in two ways in Italian. One is *frezza*, the other is *sagitta*¹. Add the suffix *aria* to the first, and *Frezzaria* results. Add the suffix *ary* to the second and *Sagittary* results. It is hardly necessary to point out that the suffix *ary* is the English equivalent of the Italian *aria*, and that 'library' is the counterpart of the Italian *libreria* or *libreria*. The resultant form *Sagittary* is a perfect counterpart in construction and meaning of *Frezzaria*. Of necessity it has undergone a transformation. For the word of Germanic origin, *frezza*, Shakespeare substituted the word of Latin derivation, *sagitta*. That substitution is easily explained. It was rendered necessary by the fact that 'Frezzary' would convey nothing to an English mind, while 'Sagittary' has at least the advantage of being founded on a word of Latin origin familiar to English ears. It is true that Shakespeare would have the authority of Marco Antonio Sabellico for his Latinised adaptation of the name, for in the *De Situ Urbis Venetae* this very street is spoken of as the *vicus sagittarius*:

Campus a fronte ad Gregorii trajectum excurrit: secus Jubanicae tecta per inflexos calles ad Angelum laeva, dextra ad Fantini itur aram... Duplici inde via in Divi Marci itur aream, laeva per sagittarium vicum, dextera pontibus duobus. In ulterioris conspectu, Mosis fanum cum acclivi turre².

But it is obvious that Sabellico did not supply the version 'Sagittary,' for in his hands the name loses all its charm, and becomes a street like any other, in any town, an undistinguished 'Archer Street.' Shakespeare's handling of the name preserves all its Venetian character, and is a fitting counterpart of the reality, suggesting to those who know Venice that narrow romantic street, the atmosphere and very essence of the place.

When the 'Sagittary' is correctly interpreted, the first act of *Othello* bears still more truly the stamp of Venice.

No more grimly fitting street than the *Frezzaria* to welcome Desdemona after her flight with the Moor; no more darkly suitable setting in all Venice for the double-edged talk of Iago with Othello, for the hasty arrival of the torch-led messengers sent by the Senate, and for the bursting

¹ *Frezza* is the Venetian counterpart of the Italian *freccia*. *Sagitta* is the literary form of *saetta*.

² Marco Antonio Coccio Sabellico da Vicovaro wrote his history of Venice in 1487. The above extract from the *De Situ Urbis* is quoted from the 1560 edition. *Opera Omnia*, Basilea, iv, p. 268.

in of the angry father's search party tracking down his daughter. If Shakespeare never set foot in Venice, it is remarkable that he went to such lengths to produce a convincing and detailed picture of the city. For it is undeniable that, where Venice is concerned, he did trouble to paint in minute details, contrary to his usual custom. *Othello* is a striking instance. Giraldi Cinthio, in his version of the tale, supplies no details whatsoever of the town: yet the scenes of the play set in Venice are packed with local colour. Cyprus in comparison is a bare rock, with nothing to distinguish it from any other island. The simplest and most satisfactory explanation is that Shakespeare followed the normal process of drawing upon his own direct knowledge of the city to complete the picture.

Venice is the setting of yet another play, and, just as the Shakespearean *Othello* supplies accurate details not to be found in Giraldi Cinthio's tale, so too the *Merchant of Venice* presents a far more vivid and detailed picture of the city, and the region round the lagoon, than can be found in Ser Giovanni's *Pecorone*. The *Merchant of Venice* is perhaps of all the plays the one which most faithfully conjures up the life and soul of an Italian city. Such a story could have unfolded in no other town. Antonio, Bassanio, Shylock and Portia could only move against the fair background of the Most Serene Republic.

There is more than historical accuracy in this story of Venetian life. There is accurate reproduction of the very bustle of the city, of life in all its aspects. Under Shakespeare's pen, Venice the great state, small in territory, mighty in spirit and in compass, rears herself up and dominates the play. Shakespeare reconstructs the grave merchant life thronging the Rialto: the Jew rubbing shoulders with the worthy magnates. He brings to life the gaiety of narrow streets in the city of carnival, crowded by night with masquers with varnished faces, romping and merry-making. He wakens with his pen the Venice of the Ducal Palace, and shows the powerful machinery of Venetian law in all its inviolable grandeur. The doge himself appears, and in his mighty presence the climax is reached. Venice herself is the protagonist.

Yet more than this. Shakespeare knew equally well Venetian country life. Belmont calls to mind the palace of Caterina Cornaro at Asolo, or one of the country residences which lined the banks of the river Brenta. Coryat speaks of them: 'When I passed down the river to Venice, I saw many goodly faire houses and palaces of pleasure on both sides of the River Brenta, which belong to the gentlemen of Venice.' They were indeed worthy of mention, some, such as the *Malcontenta*, having been designed by Andrea Palladio.

Ser Giovanni Fiorentino sketched the bare outline of a tale, but failed to blend the diverse elements into one complete whole. He gives no details whatsoever of Venice. Shakespeare departs from his crude original only to build up a perfect picture of Venetian life. As the skeleton to the living man, so is Ser Giovanni's tale to *The Merchant of Venice*. Portia puts to shame the Lady of Belmonte as Bassanio does Giannetto, as Antonio outshines Ansaldo. From a mere hint of feeble shadows, there have sprung up living creatures full of subtlety and force. From a mere hint of a lifeless region there is portrayed a powerful, true and vivid Venice. Such skill in delineation and vivification is astounding in its accuracy. Here, as always, Shakespeare shows his supreme power of remoulding and amplifying material ready to his hand. Some facts could be obtained by hearsay. Anyone might know of the Venetian galleys trading in all parts of the world, in Tripolis, Mexico, Barbary, Lisbon, England and India. The lively trade with Frankfurt might well be a subject of discussion in England. But, in all his allusions to Belmont, he appears to be writing with perfect knowledge of the district between Venice and Padua.

Above all, there is the striking passage in which Portia entrusts Balthasar with a message:

Take this same letter,
And use thou all the endeavour of a man,
In speed to Padua, see thou render this
Into my cousin's hand, Doctor Bellario,
And look what notes and garments he doth give thee,
Bring them, I pray thee, with imagin'd speed
Unto the Tranect, to the common Ferrie
Which trades to Venice; waste no time in words,
But get thee gone, I shall be there before thee.

(Act III, sc. iv, 49-57.)

This passage gives yet another proof of the remarkably detailed quality of Shakespeare's knowledge of Venice. The traveller approaching Venice from the mainland could take a ferry to cross the lagoon at three points only: at Mestre, a tiny post-house and village of small importance, a ferry used chiefly by travellers to and from Germany; secondly at Chioggia, a much longer distance from Venice and used chiefly for communication with Central and Southern Italy; lastly at Lizza Fusina, a ferry of far greater importance, for it was on the direct route between Padua and Venice.

The traveller who came from England, France, or Flanders would normally proceed to Milan, and thence through Verona and Padua to Venice, taking the ferry boat at Lizza Fusina. It was even possible to

travel the whole distance between Padua and Venice by boat down the Brenta. Or alternatively the traveller could proceed by coach to Lizza Fusina, there taking the ferry.

The journey by boat from Padua was much recommended for the beauty of the passage. The ferry boat, known as the *Burchiello*, set out from the east gate of Padua, the Porta Portello, proceeded down the Brenta, past the splendid palaces of the Venetian patricians, such as Strà, Mira and the Malcontenta, until it came to Lizza Fusina, the last village on the mainland.

At this point the stream had been diverted by means of a huge dam, constructed in order to prevent the mixing of salt and fresh water and consequent damage to the low-lying land and to the lagoon itself. Large vessels bound for Venice were prevented by the dam from entering the lagoon at this point, and were obliged to follow the course of the stream, entering the canal, Resta d'Algio, and issuing into the lagoon from the unblocked mouth of the Brenta opposite Malamocco. But small vessels, and particularly the *burchiello*, on reaching the dam stopped there and were hauled across it by an ingenious contrivance, and then lowered into the lagoon. Thus the journey was considerably shortened. This contrivance was known as the *carro*.

The 'common ferry' has been identified by some commentators with the *burchiello* at its starting-point at Padua, and Fynes Moryson has been quoted in testimony. But it must be remembered that Portia is in a great hurry to reach Venice. Bassanio has left in greatest haste to arrive in Venice with the least possible delay. In the last act, Portia assures Bassanio:

Lorenzo here
Shall witness I set forth as soon as you.

(Act v, sc. i, 270.)

She is naturally doing as Bassanio did, taking the speediest and most direct route to Venice. The *burchiello* was the most pleasant mode of conveyance from Padua to Venice, but not by any means the swiftest. So slow was the journey by this boat that it gave rise to a popular saying to indicate slowness: 'andar co la coriera e col burchiello.' Coryat left Padua by boat at seven in the morning and reached Venice at two in the afternoon, a journey of seven hours. Coronelli in his *Viaggi* notes that from Fusina to Padua, a distance of twenty miles, by coach takes four hours. From Venice to Fusina is only five miles, so that in case of urgency the whole distance could be covered in little more than five hours¹.

¹ V. Coronelli, *Viaggi*, Venezia, 1697, I, p. 86.

It is inconceivable that Portia would go to Padua to take the boat down the Brenta, when a good highway ran alongside the stream, and her coach, which she declares is already waiting at the park gates, would take her right down to Lizza Fusina far more quickly. At Lizza Fusina, of necessity she must take the boat to cross the lagoon.

This argument holds wherever Belmont is situated. Certainly there is no justification for the supposition that, because of the similarity of names, Belmont is identical with the village of Montebello near Vicenza, for Shakespeare would find the word in his original, Ser Giovanni's tale, where it appears as Belmonte. On the contrary, most indications point to Belmont being situated somewhere on the bank of the river Brenta, which was navigable even by large vessels, though the journey would be longer than for a small boat which could cross the dam at Lizza Fusina by the *carro*. Thus Bassanio, who sets out by ship from Venice, could well arrive at the gates of Belmont in his vessel.

Moreover, if Portia's words are to be taken literally, and there seems every inducement to do so, Belmont is twenty miles from Venice (Act III, sc. iv, 84):

For we must measure twenty miles to-day.

Allowing for the five miles across the lagoon, this would place Belmont at a distance of fifteen miles from Lizza Fusina, and consequently five miles from Padua, somewhere in the neighbourhood of Strà. Such a situation accounts for Portia's instructions to her servant. For Balthasar has then to ride the five miles from Belmont to Padua, obtain the notes and garments from Bellario, and then cover the twenty miles from Padua to Lizza Fusina, where he will find Portia already waiting. Hence her command:

And use thou all the endeavour of a man,
In speed to Padua...
Bring them, I pray thee, with imagin'd speed....

Portia, on the other hand, has only fifteen miles to cover to reach Lizza Fusina, as against Balthasar's twenty-five, so that she could speak with certainty; 'I shall be there before thee.' The *common ferry*, then, would seem to be the boat which left from Lizza Fusina to cross the lagoon to Venice.

The word *tranect* is still an unsolved problem. It may really have existed, derived from *tranare* or *trainare*, to drag or to draw, as Capell, Malone, Knight and Cowden-Clarke surmise. The passage then might contain direct reference to the *carro* which worked by a system of haulage. But so far no such word as *tranect* has come to light, either in English, or in a

corresponding Italian form, and in all probability there has been a corruption of some kind.

The emendation to *traject* is most generally accepted. A similar word, *traquet* corresponding to the Italian *traghetto*, was used by a French traveller of this time to indicate not only the ferry, but also the crossing of the dam. This Seigneur de Villamont, whose *Voyages* bear the date 1598, speaks of the ferries in Venice as 'treize autres lieux qu'ils nomment Traquets, où les gondoles ne manquent point pour passer d'un lieu en l'autre.' Later he relates how he left the town:

pour m'embarquer en l'une des barques qui vont chacun jour de Venise à Padouë. Lesquelles sont toutes couvertes et fort commodes, ne coustent pour chacune personne que seize sols venitiens, qui sont six sols des nostres, pour aller à Padouë, où il y a vingt cinq mille. Ausdictes barques se trouvent ordinairement diverses nations, où il convient à plusieurs de se monstrier modestes en leur parler de peur de tomber en quelque accident, pource que la plus part de ceux qui vont et viennent, sont tous couverts de iacque de maille et prompts à poignarder. Ainsi naviguant cinq mille de mer, parvinmes au traquet de Lizafousina, qui est à l'emboucheure de la mer, et de la rivière de Brente, lequel traquet ressemble à une très grande chaussée qui sépare la mer d'avec la rivière, toutefois le lieu par où l'on monte les barques est composé de bois, sur lequel par certains engins qu'un cheval faict tourner, les barques sont enlevées en un moment de la mer en la rivière. La raison pourquoy ce traquet a esté basty, ç'a esté pour conserver et empêcher la mixtion de l'eau douce avec la salée, parce que de Lizafousina on la porte jusques à Venise... De Lizafousina on peut aller si on veut par carrosse à Padouë. Toutefois le cours de l'eau est plus plaisant à cause des beaux palais qui sont edifiez à ses rives.

The word *traquet* is used here equally for the *traghetti* or ferries in Venice and for the dam at Lizza Fusina. This remote and tiny village is recorded by travellers solely on account of the dam and the ingenious contrivance for transferring boats from canal to lagoon. But so remarkable did they find it that hardly one omits to make mention of it in describing the approach to Venice. And since the natural route for travellers coming from France, England and Flanders was through Padua, of necessity many passed over the *carro*.

Marin Sanuto records in his *Itinerario per la Terraferma*¹ how, on the 15th April, 1483, he left Venice and came to 'Liza Fusina... et qui è uno caro va di qua di là, mirabelle ingegno, et passano le barche ne se pol vegnir per altra via licet ne sia una altra qui dicta Resta di Algio, et è longissima;... et di qui a Padoa è mia 20.'

A century later another famous man passed twice over the *carro*. Montaigne's *Journal de Voyage*² records how in 1580 they came to:

La Chaffousine vingt milles, où nous disnames. Ce n'est qu'une hostellerie, où l'on se met sur l'eau pour se rendre à Venise. Là abordent tous les bateaus le long de cete riviere. Avec des engins et des polies, que deux chevaus tournent à la mode de ceus

¹ *Itinerario per la Terraferma Veneziana*, ed. Rawdon Brown, 1847, p. 22.

² Montaigne, *Journal de Voyage*, ed. Louis Lautrey, 1906.

qui tournent les meules d'huile, on emporte ces barques à tout des roues qu'on leur met au dessous, par dessus un planchier de bois pour les jeter dans le canal qui se va randre en la mer, où Venise est assise. Nous y disnâmes, et nous estâmes mis dans une gondole, vinsmes souper à Venise, cinq milles.

When he left Venice, he travelled by boat towed by horses up stream to Padua.

Fynes Moryson has left an even more detailed account.

In the spring of the yeere, 1594, . . . I began my journey to see Italy, and taking boat at the East gate of Padua, the same was drawne by horses along the River Brenta; and having shot two or three small bridges, and passed twenty miles, we came to the Village Lizzafusina, where there is a damme to stop the waters of Brenta, lest in processe of time, the passage being open, the Marshes on that side of Venice should be filled with sand or earth, and so a passage be made on firme ground to the City; which they are carefull to prevent, and not without just cause, having found safety in their Isles, when Italy was often overflowed by barbarous people. Besides, they say that this damme was made, lest this fresh-water should bee mingled with their salt waters; since all the Gentlemen of Venice fetch their fresh water by boats from thence, the poorer sort being content with Well water. Heere whiles our boat was drawne by an Instrument, out of the River Brenta, into the Marshes of Venice, wee the passengers refreshed ourselves with meat and wine, and according to the custome agreed upon the price of our meat before wee did eat it. Then we entred our boat againe, and passed five miles to Venice, upon the marshes thereof: and each man paid for his passage a lire, or twenty sols, and for a horse more than ordinary, that we might be drawne more swiftly from Padua to Lizzafusina, each man paid foure sols, but the ordinary passage is only sixteene sols. We might have had coaches, but since a boat passeth daily too and fro betwene these Cities, most men use this passage as most convenient. For the boat is covered with arched hatches, and there is very pleasant company, so a man beware to give no offence: for otherwise the Lumbards carry shirts of Male, and being armed as if they were in a Camp, are apt to revenge upon shamefull advantages. But commonly there is pleasant discourse, and the proverb saith, that the boat shall bee drowned, when it carries neither Monke, nor Student, nor Curtisan (they love them too well to call them whores) the passengers being for the most part of these kindes.

Coryat also, travelling to Venice not many years later, records the pleasant journey down the river Brenta, and adds:

When I came to the aforesaid Lucie Fesina, I saw Venice, and not before, which yeeldeth the most glorious and heavenly shew upon the water that ever any mortal eye beheld, such a shew as did even ravish me both with delight and admiration. This Lucie Fesina is at the uttermost point and edge of the lande, being five miles on this side Venice. There the fresh and salt water would meete and be confounded together, were it not kept asunder by a sluice that is made for the same purpose, over which sluice the Barkes that go forth and backe betwixt Padua and Venice are lifted up by a certain crane. At this Lucie Fesina I went out of my barke, and tooke a Gondola which brought me to Venice.

The anonymous author of the *Itinerarium Italiae Totius*, published in 1602, speaks of Lizza Fusina and the remarkable contrivance: 'Hic pulchro artificio navigatur non mari, sed terra.' In the *Hercules Prodicus* it is spoken of as a *Machina Traductrix*¹, and it is alluded to in much the same terms by Andrea Scoto and Paul Hentzner in their *Itineraries*.

¹ *Hercules Prodicus, seu Principis Iuventutis vita et Peregrinatio*, per Stephanum Vinandum Pighium Campensem, Antwerp, 1587.

Later writers, however, have left still more detailed descriptions of the ingeniously built *carro*. Coronelli explains its construction. It consisted of two slipways built of wood and stone, two slopes down which sleds made of wood ran on a track into the water. The boat approached the foot of the slope, and the sled was fixed beneath it. The sled with the boat upon it was hauled to the top by means of ropes and pulleys suspended from a beam. The sled then ran down the corresponding slope on the other side; the boat was unfixed and proceeded on its way. There were two of these sleds, working side by side, one for the boats coming from Venice, one for those coming from Padua, the difference lying in the placing of the beams and consequent adjustment of haulage power. This *carro* was still in use in Shakespeare's time, for it was not finally done away with until 1614 or 1615, when it was supplanted by a system of locks. In the State Archives in Venice there are preserved documents relating to the Pesaro family, known as Pesaro del Carro, because of their ownership of the *carro*. They in 1514 had been granted the right of keeping the inn at Lizza Fusina, together with the toll for the crossing of the dam by the *carro*, and certain apparatus for the cleansing of wool. In 1612 the Pesaro family made an appeal to the Republic for compensation for loss of income owing to the disuse of the *carro*, a double loss, because not only were the tolls for passage no longer forthcoming, but the inn was no longer frequented. They were awarded as indemnity the annual sum of 281 ducats, to be paid 'dal giorno che le barche comincerano a transitare per altro luogo che per il carro.'

It is noticeable that the word used for the crossing of the *carro* is *transit*, and in the official documents relating to Lizza Fusina the word *transit* constantly recurs. On March 28, 1444, the *transit of Lizza Fusina* was awarded to a certain Giacomo Barbusa, and again in November, 1455, the *transit*, together with the toll, was conceded to a certain Maestro Antonio Maria de Franzon Ingegneri. In 1469 and in 1479 mention is made of the *transito di Lizafusina* and in later years, for instance in 1485 and in 1489, there are records of the 'incanto del transito del canal di Lizafusina,' so also in the year 1500. Moreover, these documents all bear as heading the words 'transit of Lizza Fusina¹.'

It is just possible that the true reading of *tranect* may be *trancet* for *transit*. Old forms of the word exist, such as *trancyte*. The letter C is freely interchanged with S in Elizabethan writings, for example *recide* for

¹ *Archivio di Stato di Venezia. Savi ed Esec. alle Acque*, 348, cap. 42-44. *Collegio del Sal. Reg. 10, Cap. 156; Reg. 10, Cap. 187t, 188, 235t, 241*. Florio in his *World of Words* translates *transito* as a *passage over*.

reside, in *Othello*, or *ceaze*, *falce* and *sence* in Shakespeare's Sonnets. *Transect* for *transit* would be no more abnormal than *lawnset* for *lancet*. Such a reading might satisfy those commentators who reject the emendation to *traject* and believe that the passage contains some reference to the *carro*.

Though the word *transect* must still be regarded as an unsolved problem, there seems to be no doubt whatsoever that the reference to the *common ferry* concerns the ferry at Lizza Fusina, and one fact stands out clearly. Shakespeare, by his very allusion to the common ferry, falls into one particular group, namely the group of travellers to Venice, for it is only amongst records left by travellers to Venice that any mention of the ferry at that remote village is found.

It is a far cry from Stratford meadows, from London river and London town, to Venice and the lagoon. Can such accurate allusions to the 'Sagittary,' to the 'common ferry,' together with the vivid detailed picture of Venice, be solely the fruit of intuitive knowledge? Or did Shakespeare speak advisedly and with full experience when, in *Love's Labour's Lost*, he quoted the travellers who say of Venice,

Venetia, Venetia,
Chi non ti vede, non ti pretia?

VIOLET M. JEFFERY.

LONDON.

THE VOGUE OF VICTOR HUGO IN SPAIN¹

OF the preliminary investigations which still remain to be made before it becomes possible to write a history of Spanish Romanticism, the most important part concerns the French Romantic dramatists and their influence in Spain. We propose here to examine the most substantial of these influences, that of Victor Hugo, considering first the nature and extent of his vogue in Spain, chiefly between the important years 1830 and 1845, and, in two subsequent articles, discussing in greater detail his influence upon lyric and narrative poetry, drama and prose fiction. As the material which we have collected is more abundant than in many studies of this nature, we shall be obliged to substitute references for quotations, except where our sources are not easily accessible, and to assume an acquaintance with the very few studies on Spanish Romanticism which have been published since the Romantic movement began². At the conclusion of the third article will appear a bibliographical appendix to the series³.

One general remark may be prefaced to this article which will apply to all three. The influence in Spain of Chateaubriand, of Scott, of Byron, of Schlegel, of Manzoni—all these are comparatively easy to estimate. Each of these authors stands for aims and ideals quite separate and distinct, and even where two of them represent the same *genre*, they are individual enough not to be confused. But Victor Hugo and his fellow-Romantics, especially in drama, are easily confused with one another, and Spanish critics of the nineteenth century did not distinguish too clearly between Hugo, Dumas, Soulié, Sue, Ducange and other authors now almost forgotten but in their own day popular. Further, since Hugo was the chief of the French Romantics, all the characteristics of the rest were apt

¹ This article, like those which are to follow it, was originated by Miss Parker, who covered the whole of the ground so far as was possible in the British Museum and in the libraries of the University of Barcelona and of the Institut d'Estudis Catalans, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. This was worked over in Madrid by Professor Allison Peers, who also incorporated the results of researches in the libraries of Madrid, of the Universities of Valencia and Seville and of the Biblioteca de Menéndez y Pelayo in Santander, and is responsible for the final form of the articles. The authors are indebted to Srta de Lara and Miss I. L. McClelland, of the Universities of Liverpool and Glasgow, for help in tracing several of the bibliographical items.

² Notably with M. le Gentil's *Le Poète Manuel Bretón de los Herreros* (Paris, 1909) and *Les Revues Littéraires de l'Espagne*, etc. (Paris, 1909); with the important third chapter of vol. I of Sr Alonso Cortés' *Zorrilla, su vida y sus obras* (Valladolid, 1916), and with Professor Allison Peers' articles in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xvi, 1921, pp. 281-96; xviii, 1923, pp. 37-50; xxi, 1926, pp. 44-54, and his *El Romanticismo en España: Caracteres especiales de su desenvolvimiento en algunas provincias*, Santander, 1924.

³ The bibliographical indications in the footnotes to these articles refer to the appendix.

to be attributed to him. Especially is it hard to distinguish between references to Hugo and to Dumas, and no less so to know when the names of these two writers have any critical significance beyond that of the words 'French Romanticism.' References like the following can literally be found by the score in contemporary Spanish criticism:

Un año más tarde, el 22 de Marzo de 1835, ofrecióse a la apreciación de este mismo público, a quien ya, por otro lado, eran familiares los dramas de Victor Hugo y Dumas y estaba acostumbrado a las grandes sensaciones que le ofrecía la nueva escuela, otro drama de atrevido y magistral desarrollo....¹

[This can only mean that Romantic drama as a whole was familiar, for, as we shall see, practically nothing was known of Hugo's dramas by the ordinary Spanish public early in 1835.]

Oigo que toda la gente que estaba, como suele decirse, en la cuerda se apellidaba furiosamente romántica, y que primero renunciaría a sus padres y a sus pueblos y hasta sus nombres, que a ser discípulos de Dumas y Victor Hugo².

[This might be interpreted by any reader literally, but undoubtedly the phrase 'Dumas y Victor Hugo' is not so meant.]

We have been compelled to use our judgment in accepting or rejecting as evidence passages worded in such terms as these. The rejection of some of them may account for the omission from this article of frequently quoted contemporary criticisms: unfortunately space forbids the discussion of doubtful evidence.

I.

When Larra, in his well-known critique of the Spanish version of *Catherine Howard*, commented on the suddenness of the invasion of French Romanticism³, he was writing from the standpoint of the general literary public, which had not realised that this invasion had, on a smaller scale, been in progress for decades⁴. But, had he substituted 'Victor Hugo' for 'Alejandro Dumas,' he would, from the historical as well as from the popular standpoint, have been nearer the truth. Victor Hugo published his first *Odes* in 1822, his *Han d'Islande* in 1823, his *Odes et Ballades* and *Bug Jargal* in 1826, his *Cromwell*, with its famous Preface, in 1827, his *Orientales* in 1829, his *Hernani* in 1830. Yet it is not till some time after all these had appeared that we find the first signs of Spain's interest in him.

The comparatively late date at which the leader of French Romanticism

¹ Mesonero Romanos, *Memorias de un Setentón*, Madrid, 1881, II, p. 145.

² *El Cisne*, Seville, 1838, pp. 145-8.

³ 'Catalina Howard,' in the (so-called) *Obras completas* of Figaro (Paris, Garnier, n.d., III, pp. 61-7): 'Entre nosotros en un año solo hemos pasado en política de Fernando VII a las próximas constituyentes, y en literatura de Moratín a Alejandro Dumas.'

⁴ No full historical account of the invasion has yet been given, but suggestions may be found in Le Gentil's *Bretón de los Herreros*, pp. 93-4. The subject will receive attention in Professor Allison Peers' forthcoming book on Spanish Romanticism.

became known across the Pyrenees is one of the most surprising facts revealed by a detailed study of foreign influences in Spain. That his poetry and prose fiction were for long unappreciated is not remarkable, for Romantic poetry in Spain developed very tardily, and her few indifferent novelists were too busily occupied in translating and imitating Sir Walter Scott¹, who succeeded Chateaubriand in popularity², to pay attention to any other models. But in drama one would have supposed things to have been different. Spain had long been enjoying imported historical drama and melodrama: Casimir Delavigne, Pixérécourt, Caigniez and Alexandre Duval were all acted in Madrid before 1825³, while Ducange and Dumas père began to be given in 1830. Far greater than any of these was Victor Hugo, and far more imposing was his position in French literary society. Yet Agustín Durán's long and important *Discurso* of 1828⁴ makes no mention, from beginning to end, either of the *Préface de Cromwell* or of Victor Hugo himself; *Hernani* was not represented in Spain, nor published in Spanish, till 1835; and the first work of Hugo's in Spanish, which did not appear till 1834, was neither *Cromwell*, nor *Hernani*, nor *Notre Dame de Paris*, but—*Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*!

The explanation usually given for the tardiness of the development of foreign influences in Spain is, of course, the political and social conditions during the reign of Ferdinand VII.

Durante los últimos años de Fernando (writes the somewhat untrustworthy Piñeyro, for example) hasta su muerte en 1833, los rigores de la censura se ejercían por igual sobre escritos españoles y sobre los que se importaban del extranjero. No penetraban fácilmente en Madrid las primeras obras de los románticos franceses, sospechosas desde luego por su procedencia, su carácter innovador y el poco respeto que las informaba hacia la dignidad real, tal como en España se comprendía; y si bien Larra, que conocía perfectamente el francés, lograría probablemente leer las novedades de Francia, de seguro que muy pocos en España pudieron poseer y saborear los libros de Victor Hugo y demás románticos hasta que expiró el monarca y comenzó a levantarse la densa niebla que cubría el país⁵.

These conditions, however, while valid enough as accounting for the lateness of the abortive Romantic 'movement' in Spain⁶, will hardly serve to explain the unresponsiveness in the country to Victor Hugo in

¹ Cf. E. Allison Peers, 'Studies in the influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain,' in *Revue Hispanique*, 1926, LXVIII, pp. 1-160.

² Cf. E. Allison Peers, 'La Influencia de Chateaubriand en España,' *Revista de Filología Española*, 1924, XI, pp. 351-82; Jean Sarrailh, 'La Fortune d'Atala en Espagne,' *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal*, Madrid, 1925, I, pp. 255-68.

³ Le Gentil, *Les Revues Littéraires*, etc., pp. viii, 5, 14.

⁴ *Discurso sobre el influjo que ha tenido la crítica moderna en la decadencia del teatro antiguo español*, etc.

⁵ *El Romanticismo en España*, Paris, 1904, pp. 15-16.

⁶ On this point, cf. articles mentioned on p. 36, n. 2.

particular. After all, there were nineteen Spanish editions of Chateaubriand published between 1800 and 1830¹; translations of Byron, which had hardly begun in 1826, had totalled twenty-six by 1830²; while Scott, who appears in periodical literature by 1818, is translated continually in book form from 1825 onwards³. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the late entry of Hugo into Spain was chiefly accidental—one of the phenomena of literary history that cannot be accounted for. Had the Spain of 1825 taken as much interest in Romantic poetry as it did in melodrama, or had political conditions in Spain been less obstructive, his vogue would have begun earlier and lasted longer: more than this it is impossible with any certainty to say.

When precisely did Victor Hugo first become known in Spain? Ventura de la Vega, a member of the Parnasillo, describes the date, in a very nearly contemporary document, as 'por los años de 1830.'

Pero la invasión romántica tuvo para cruzar el Pirineo y extenderse rápidamente en España, una aliada de mucho poder, un poeta de vivísima fantasía. . . . Victor Hugo, en fin, fué el primero cuyas obras penetraron en España por los años de 1830, y plantaron la nueva banda⁴.

He tells us that all who came from France to Spain after the literary outburst brought with them copies of *Notre Dame de Paris* and *Hernani*:

Ambas cosas olían a 'libertad,' a 'quitar trabas,' a 'desarraigar abusos,' a dar 'libre vuelo al pensamiento': de todo pues se hizo un baturrillo y todo se puso en moda, el 'liberalismo' y el 'romanticismo'.

Against this statement of Ventura de la Vega we have to place another, still more nearly contemporary, to the effect that Hugo's works did not appear in Madrid before 1834⁵. This latter date is confirmed by our own bibliography⁷. If, however, we suppose Vega to be referring to the 'penetration' of Hugo's works in their original language (as the terminology and context of the quotation suggest), there is no contradiction between the two authorities, both of which are supported by others.

The first reference to Victor Hugo in Spain which is more than a

¹ This we calculate from Allison Peers (*op. cit.*, pp. 367-73) and Sarrailh (*op. cit.*, pp. 255-7).

² Phillip H. Churchman, 'The Beginnings of Byronism in Spain,' in *Revue Hispanique*, 1910, xxiii, pp. 333-410.

³ See Churchman and Peers, 'A Survey of the Influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain,' in *Revue Hispanique*, 1922, lv, pp. 227-310.

⁴ 'Discurso que leyó D. Ventura de la Vega al tomar asiento en la Academia, 3 de febrero de 1842,' in *Memorias de la Academia Española*, Año iv, Tomo II, Madrid, 1870, p. 8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁶ 'Hasta el año 1834 no aparecieron en Madrid las obras de Victor Hugo,' *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1839-40, p. 189.

⁷ Cf. Bibliography, No. 1.

passing mention occurs in 1831, where J. M. Heredia, in the periodical *Miscelánea*, writes thus of Hugo's poems:

Después de Lamartine, citaremos en el estilo romántico a Victor Hugo, cuyas odas son bastante felices en concepción poética, aunque las desfigura una fraseología vaga y enigmática¹.

Considering the fame which Hugo had already achieved in France, Heredia's criticism is brief and insignificant, but he seems to be writing of the *Odes* only. The fact that he makes no mention of the *Orientales*, though they had appeared in Paris two years before he wrote, is significant of the little attention which Hugo was attracting in Spain. Still more so is an article in *Miscelánea* for 1832, entitled *Ensayo sobre la Novela*², which deals with various non-Spanish novelists, but contains no reference to Victor Hugo, although by this time four of his novels had been published in France. His most famous novel, *Notre Dame de Paris*, was adapted in Spain even before it was translated. López Soler, one of the editors of the *Europeo*³, who, under the pseudonym Don Gregorio de Miranda, had already written various novels, produced another in 1834 entitled *La Catedral de Sevilla, Novela tomada de Nuestra Señora de París de Victor Hugo*. In this same year another novel of Victor Hugo's, *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*, translated by José García de Villalta, was given to the Spanish public⁴.

This year (1834) marks the sudden irruption into Spain of the fame of Victor Hugo. The date is significant; for, although, as we have seen, we cannot, in face of the earlier Spanish vogue of other foreign writers, accept the nature of Ferdinand VII's *régime* as completely explaining Spanish ignorance of Hugo, it was inevitable that, once the frontier walls were broken down, it should be Hugo who would come in on the crest of the invasion. So we have in 1834, not only the publication in Madrid of García de Villalta's translation (entitled in Spanish, *El Último Día de un Reo de Muerte*)⁵, but also a number of press references which bear witness to the success of the invasion.

Of these last, three in particular deserve mention. The *Boletín de Comercio*, reviewing *Notre Dame de Paris*, which had not then been turned into Spanish, describes its author as 'el Homero de esta literatura de nuevo cuño.' '*Nuestra Señora de París*,' it adds, 'merece ser su *Iliado*

¹ *Miscelánea*, III, p. 93.

² *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 65 ff.

³ Cf. E. Allison Peers, 'Some Provincial Periodicals in Spain during the Romantic Movement,' in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1920, xv, pp. 375-82.

⁴ Cf. Bibliography, No. 1.

⁵ See p. 38 above and Bibliography, No. 1. We have not space to quote an interesting review of this translation which will be found in the *Artista* for 1835, I, pp. 40-3.

(sic)¹. The *Eco del Comercio*, on the other hand, is much more critical of the same novel, but admits that, if it has all the vices of Romanticism, it also has all its beauties². But it is *El Vapor*, a Barcelona review of considerable importance, which devotes the greatest space to Victor Hugo during 1834. At the end of the preceding year it had confessed to 'awaiting with impatience the success of M. Victor Hugo's new drama on Mary Tudor³.' A few days later begins a series of three articles which may be said to mark the invasion in a quite decisive manner. The first article⁴ describes the French production of *Marie Tudor* as 'dando margen, como todas las obras de este célebre poeta, a fervoroso entusiasmo y a crítica universal y ardiente,' and its author, in a phrase which recalls López Soler's *Europeo* articles of twelve years before, as 'siguiendo a un mismo tiempo las huellas de Goethe, Byron y Shakespeare.' It goes on to examine in some detail Hugo's dramatic formulae: the remaining articles analyse the plot of *Marie Tudor*⁵ and translate some passages from it⁶. A later article, forming part of a series on modern drama⁷, deals with *Hernani*; as it embodies the first serious criticism of Hugo to be published in Spain, it may be briefly excerpted:

Hernani, la primera obra dramática de Victor Hugo, luce cierto entusiasmo lírico que no pocas veces chispea de elocuencia y animación. El carácter general de la suya es caballeresco, heroico, español: y el hidalgo de Castilla que domina en sus escenas, uno de los caracteres más bien dibujados del teatro francés. Sentimos no poder tributar iguales elogios al plan de tal composición, ni aun a los demás personajes que intervienen en su enlace. Aquel guerrillero que se vende a sí mismo, aquella corneta poco menos que mágica, cuyos ecos, como la del flechero de Scott, anuncian un singular acaecimiento, pertenecen a la hechicería, a las fábulas caballerescas, a la ópera tal vez, pero nunca a la tragedia....

II.

In 1835 begins the brief epoch of Hugo's true popularity in Spain, corresponding almost exactly with the brief reign of Romantic drama. The chief event to be chronicled in that year is the first representation in Spain of one of Hugo's plays—a distinction, however, which went, not, as might have been expected, to *Hernani* (1830) but to *Lucrece Borgia*, which had been produced in France three years later, and was given in Madrid, at the Teatro del Príncipe, in July, 1835. Testimony to the reception of the play in Spain is as divided as that to the reception of *Don Álvaro*⁸. *El Vapor* gives a synopsis of the plot, reproduces some

¹ *Boletín de Comercio*, 1834, III, No. 17.

² *Eco del Comercio*, 1834, I, No. 17.

³ *El Vapor*, December 22, 1833, No. 106, Crónica Teatral.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 6, January 14, 1834.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 9, January 21, 1834.

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 15, February 4, 1834.

⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 96, July 27, 1834.

⁸ See E. Allison Peers, *Rivas, a Critical Study*, New York, Paris, 1923, pp. 69–80.

criticisms of a Madrid review and reports favourably on the production of the play at the Príncipe. 'El público, aun el público clásico, salió tan conmovido como hubiera podido desear Victor Hugo¹.' Eugenio de Ochoa, writing in the Romantic review *El Artista*², declared that the representation of this drama caused 'más asombro que agrado.' '*Lucrecia Borgia*,' he continues, 'es una creación tan gigantesca como el genio de Victor Hugo.' In his opinion the drama will appeal enthusiastically to any age or nation capable of understanding it, and thus he believes that the day will come when Spain, better acquainted with similar dramas, will receive it with 'más agrado que asombro':

Quando nuestro público se familiarice con la poesía grandiosa del género romántico; cuando a la sorpresa y al susto que ahora le causan los dramas de esta naturaleza suceda en su ánimo la meditación, creemos que le gustará *Lucrecia Borgia* y todas las obras de Victor Hugo.

On the other hand, Ventura de la Vega would have us believe that the Spanish public, heedless of all but its dramatic effects, accepted *Lucrecia Borgia* with enthusiasm:

Nuestro público, hábil en sorprender las inverisimilitudes materiales del drama, pero ciego de todo punto respecto de los morales, se dejó cautivar por el interés novelesco de la fábula, por el trueque de los venenos y los contravenenos, por la canción báquica con acompañamiento de 'De Profundis,' por la procesión de los agonizantes blancos, por los cinco ataúdes y otros mil resortes dramáticos³.

Ventura de la Vega asserts that *Lucrecia Borgia* was the first translation of a foreign Romantic drama to be given in Spain, and that no sooner was it given than others 'rained upon the stage⁴' to follow up its success. Any close student of the period knows that the first of these two statements is far from correct; but, once again, it will pass muster if we are dealing with general impressions. It was no doubt the first French Romantic drama of importance to command general attention. In this connexion it is interesting to read in the *Artista* a 'profession of faith,' made by the company responsible for the production of *Lucrecia Borgia*,

¹ *El Vapor*, No. 210, July 29, 1835.

² *El Artista*, II, pp. 47 ff.

³ 'Discurso,' etc., p. 13. Bretón de los Herreros, in his play *Me voy de Madrid* (December 21, 1835), makes Manuela ('una mujer romántica') say:

¡Y yo que anoche
estuve en *Lucrecia Borgia*!...
Quiero decir, en el drama
que de este modo se nombra.
¡Aquella sí que es mujer!
No porque yo me proponga
imitarla en sus maldades.
Pero ¡qué alma tan hidrópica
de agitaciones sublimes!

Bretón's satire is directed chiefly against the middle-class audiences who affected allegiance to Hugo and his French contemporaries because it was the fashion.

⁴ Ventura de la Vega, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

which suggests that the decision to play it was due to the interest created by *Don Álvaro* and its immediate Romantic predecessors. 'La empresa,' runs the passage, 'ha observado con suma atención el efecto producido por *Don Álvaro* y otros pocos dramas originales escritos en el gusto de la indicada moderna escuela.' Neither plays of the seventeenth nor of the eighteenth century can draw a Spanish audience: 'Raro es el día en que se logra reunir más de 100 personas en la representación de una obra maestra de Moratín.' The 'drama grave, profundo, filosófico de la novísima escuela francesa' is the drama of the near future¹.

A second of Hugo's plays was translated and produced in 1835—still not *Hernani*, but *Angelo*, which had been given in French only in April of the same year and was produced at the Príncipe on August 23. The success of this play in Madrid apparently recommended it to Barcelona, where it was represented four times, on December 14, 15, 16 and 31. The *Diario de Barcelona* printed an amusing announcement of the last performance which begins thus:

Teatro. Para la noche de hoy 31 de diciembre de 1835. Los porteros y cobradores de él somos los que cerramos las puertas a los beneficios en el año que va a expirar. Nos ha dejado lugar antes de su muerte para declararnos *románticos* supuesto que el *romanticismo* se va haciendo de moda; por lo tanto no haremos como otros años en que era nuestra costumbre el pedir el aguinaldo, u ofrecer un ramillete de flores, o felicitar el año nuevo a todo el mundo.

Románticos los amores,
Románticas las comedias,
Románticas las tragedias,
Románticos cobradores².

The *Vapor*³ gives some interesting details, again at second hand, about the performance, and adds the following criticism:

Este drama, en medio de ser tanto su movimiento, es sumamente sencillo en su trama, en sus progresos y en su desenlace: tanto que si algunos ingenios, o por excesivamente tímidos o por desconfiar de sus fuerzas, se hubieran abstenido de poner en escena tan arriesgado asunto, ningún apasionado de los preceptos clásicos le hubiera recusado en cuanto a sus formas. Los interlocutores son pocos, la duración de la acción apenas pasa de 48 horas, acaece en ámbito de una sola ciudad, y mucha parte de ella en el de una alcoba, y por último, no recurre el poeta a los auxiliares de numeroso acompañamiento, seductor aparato y otros recursos semejantes, y aun menos a batallas y tempestades y trasgos y fantasmas. El drama, sin embargo, es obra de un poeta romántico. Sirva esto de aviso a los que, clamando con más petulancia que reflexión contra la esclavitud de las reglas, creen deshonorar la bandera en que, guiados sólo por el atractivo de la novedad, sin vocación verdadera, sin estudio, desprecian y palean los tratados de poética, y piensan que la desempeñada licencia de amontonar horrores, hacinar absurdos y acumular extravagancias es el bello ideal en punto a literatura dramática.

¹ *El Artista*, II, pp. 34-5.

² Cf. E. Allison Peers, *El Romanticismo en España*, p. 21.

³ *El Vapor*, No. 245, September 2, 1835.

But, whatever its criticisms, *El Vapor* was glad that this play '[que] hizo furor en Francia y no poco ha gustado en Madrid, Valencia y otros teatros de España,' should be represented in Barcelona—as it was that same December. 'It is clear,' comments the chronicler, 'that the Barcelona public continues to give proof of its liking for Romanticism¹.' The *Guardia Nacional*, after the first three Barcelona performances, congratulated itself likewise. 'El romanticismo ha adquirido un lauro más en Barcelona, y nosotros, que no somos sus secuaces, hemos aplaudido anoche con entusiasmo y afición².' It is evident, however, that the applause of the *Guardia*'s dramatic critic was not echoed throughout the house.

Hubo murmullos que sofocar, voces a que imponer silencio y risas inmoderadas que hubiesen deseado reprimir aquéllos a quienes conmovían profundamente las combinaciones filosóficas del profundo escritor, puestas en acción con bastante acierto por nuestra compañía española³.

Hernani was the third of Hugo's plays to be represented in Spanish, but it found its first home, not in Madrid, but in Valencia, where it was given on December 25, 1835. It was announced a month beforehand⁴ with great *éclat*:

Este drama que todavía no se ha representado en ningún teatro de la Península y que fué aceptado como la obra maestra de su autor . . . esperamos que será uno de los que más agradarán al público, no sólo por recordar el tiempo de nuestras glorias, sino también por su mérito extraordinario.

The translation used, that of Altes y Gurena, was published in the same year⁵.

Further progress in the propagation of Victor Hugo's works was due to the energetic editor of the *Artista*, Eugenio de Ochoa, who returned to Spain in 1834, filled with enthusiasm for Romantic ideals, and forthwith set about familiarising his countrymen with them. He began by translating two of Hugo's novels, *Bug Jargal* (1826) and *Han d'Islande* (1823), both of which were published in 1835⁶. The former was eulogised in the *Correo de las Damas*⁷ and its author described as 'el célebre escritor que tiene en admiración hoy a toda la Francia y a la mayor parte de la Europa.' This year, then, marked the representation of three of Hugo's dramas, and the circulation of two of his novels, besides the dissemina-

¹ *El Vapor*, No. 345, December 10, 1835. *Angelo* was given in Barcelona also on December 14, 15, 16, 31, and January 2, 18, 19, 28, 1836.

² *Guardia Nacional*, No. 21, December 17, 1835.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Diario Mercantil de Valencia*, November 29, 1835. Cf. E. Allison Peers, *art. cit.*, p. 39.

⁵ Cf. Bibliography, No. 5.

⁶ Cf. *Ibid.*, Nos. 3, 4.

⁷ 1835, III, p. 367.

tion of probably more information about him than had previously entered Spain¹.

In 1836 were translated, also by Ochoa, two of Hugo's best known works—*Hernani*² and *Notre Dame de Paris*³. This second translation of *Hernani*, which was received with the highest praise⁴, and was eulogised by Théophile Gautier⁵, was used for the *estreno* of the play in Madrid on August 14, 1836. This (even, let it be noted, at the height of the Romantic movement) was distinctly not a success. Though it helped to bring Victor Hugo farther into the limelight⁶, it did him no good as a dramatist. Larra, who was well acquainted with Hugo's dramas in the original⁷, and had several times asserted that he was over-imaginative, and less great as a dramatist than as a poet, pointed out with emphasis the weakness of *Hernani* as it appeared to a Spanish audience. The French public, 'amigo de declamaciones y de pinceladas históricas,' might appreciate Hugo's

¹ The *Guardia Nacional* of Barcelona, on December 1, 1835, publishes this striking announcement of the series: 'El prospecto que las anuncia, traducidas al español, encarece con razón el mérito de este eminente escritor—su nombre (dice) popular ya en todos los países cultos sólo es conocido en España como el de un gran poeta dramático. Como filósofo, como poeta lírico, como novelista, apenas es conocido Victor Hugo entre nosotros. Una de las más dulces recompensas para el escritor distinguido en estos tiempos es la de ser traducidas las obras a todas las lenguas de los países civilizados. En todos ellos lo han sido ya las de Victor Hugo, menos en España, donde sólo conocemos algunos pocos, y sin embargo a nadie, después de los franceses, le toca tanta parte como a nosotros en la gloria de este genio educado en España, entusiasta e imitador tal vez de la literatura española, y casi español, pues que nació en Besanzón—"Ciudad antigua española," como dice el mismo Victor Hugo en una de sus más brillantes composiciones.

Estas circunstancias han movido al editor de la presente obra a dar principio a la azarosa empresa de publicar, en estos tiempos de turbulencias, en una serie de volúmenes, las obras de Victor Hugo, si encuentran aceptación en el público, como es de esperar, las primeras entregas; y truncadas, si no encuentran dichas primeras entregas la expresada aceptación.

Por el pronto, el editor se propone, desde el 1º de diciembre, publicar por suscripción, en entregas de seis pliegos cada una, las dos primeras obras de Victor Hugo: el Bug Jargall y el Han d'Islandia. Estas dos preciosas novelas, traducidas por el joven D. Eugenio de Ochoa, constarán de nueve entregas que saldrán a luz de ocho en ocho días. Esto es lo que promete al público por ahora; salvo a seguir con las demás obras del autor, si sus trabajos son apreciados por el público.'

² On Ochoa's treatment of his original, see A. Morel-Fatio, 'L'Hispanisme dans Victor Hugo,' in *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal*, etc., Madrid, 1925, I, pp. 196-7.

³ Cf. Bibliography, Nos. 8, 9.

⁴ Cf. for example the eulogies of Larra (*Obras completas de Figaro*, ed. Garnier, III, pp. 116-17): 'La traducción que de este célebre drama se nos ha dado es una de las mejores traducciones que en lengua alguna pueden existir. El traductor de las obras de Victor Hugo ha tratado a *Hernani* con rara predilección, con cariño: un lenguaje purísimo, un sabor castellano, una versificación cuidada, armoniosa, rica, poética, la colocan en el número de las obras literarias de más dificultad y de más mérito... Traduzcan los demás como el señor de Ochoa, y nuestra pluma, constantemente imparcial, correrá sobre el papel para el elogio con más placer que para la amarga crítica, etc.' Even the somewhat exacting Juan Martínez Villergas thought highly of Ochoa as a translator (cf. his *Juicio crítico de los poetas españoles contemporáneos*, Paris, 1854, p. 191).

⁵ Cf. *Voyage en Espagne*, Paris, 1883, p. 64.

⁶ The *Semanario Pintoresco*, for example, has a biography of him (I, pp. 37-8).

⁷ Cf. for example Larra, *ed. cit.*, p. 17, where he discusses *Marion de Lorme* and *Le Roi s'amuse*, which had not at the time been represented in Spanish.

picture of 'el honor castellano' ('fantástico y exagerado como él lo entiende'), but the Spanish public did not:

En la escena española todos esos motivos de buen éxito no existían: tomando aquí las producciones extranjeras, no en el orden en que ven la luz, sino buenamente cuando y como podemos, *Hernani*, primer paso de la escuela moderna, ha venido a presentarse a nuestra vista después de haber apurado nosotros hasta los excesos de esa escuela. La parsimonia misma de efectos sorprendentes que ha usado el autor nos lo debía hacer parecer pálido y descolorido después de *Lucrecia Borgia* y de *Catalina Howard*¹.

Apart from this and other criticisms of a general kind, Larra objects to the use of the oath-motif—'cosa realmente que hace morir de risa al espectador más grave'²—and to the whole of the last act of the play, especially its catastrophe.

Este final desgraciado que no podía presumirse en el transcurso del drama, poco preparado y fundado en una cosa tal como cumplir un juramento, ha sido causa de que no fuese coronado *Hernani* de aplausos, como parecía hacerlo esperar el placer con que los actos anteriores habían sido oídos³.

With this criticism of Larra may be compared others gleaned by Théophile Gautier, who saw Ochoa's version of the play performed at Valladolid in 1840⁴:

La pièce est rendue vers par vers avec une exactitude scrupuleuse à l'exception de quelques passages et de quelques scènes que l'on a dû retrancher pour satisfaire aux exigences du public. La scène des portraits est réduite à rien, parce que les espagnols la considèrent comme injurieux pour eux et s'y trouvent indirectement tournés en ridicule. Il y a aussi beaucoup de suppressions dans le cinquième acte. En général les espagnols se fâchent lorsqu'on parle d'eux d'une manière poétique; ils se prétendent calomniés par Hugo, par Mérimée, et par tous ceux en général qui ont écrit sur l'Espagne, oui... calomniés, mais en beau. Ils renient de toutes leurs forces l'Espagne du *Romancero* et des *Orientales*, et une de leurs principales prétentions c'est de 'être ni poétique ni pittoresque, prétentions hélas trop bien justifiées'⁵.

Even so early, then, we find a critic of the reputation and the Romantic sympathies of Larra looking askance at Victor Hugo's dramatic fame. In this same article he declares that his plays are inferior to those of Dumas—'Le hemos marcado en el teatro un puesto inferior al que nos parece ocupar Alejandro Dumas'⁶—and this statement, in a notice of Dumas' *Teresa*, he amplifies considerably. Victor Hugo, he says, is more audacious, more *colossal* (a typically Romantic adjective) than Dumas, more poetical, more imaginative and more declamatory. But, as to Dumas:

Dumas tiene menos imaginación, en nuestro entender, pero más corazón; y cuando Victor Hugo asombra, él conmueve: menos brillantéz por tanto, y estilo menos poético y florido; pero en cambio menos redundancia, menos episodios, menos extrava-

¹ Larra, *ed. cit.*, p. 116. Cf. the carefully tempered praise mingled with shrewd criticism accorded to *Hernani* by the *Guardia Nacional*, June 25, 1837.

² *Ibid.*, p. 118.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 119, and the earlier criticism in *El Vapor*, 1834, already quoted, p. 41 above.

⁴ Vicomte Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Théophile Gautier*, Paris, 1887, I, p. 209.

⁵ Gautier, *Voyage en Espagne*, Paris, 1883, p. 64.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

gancia; las pasiones hondamente desentrañadas, magistralmente conocidas, y hábilmente manejadas, forman siempre la armazón de sus dramas; más conocedor del corazón humano que poeta, tiene situaciones más dramáticas, porque son generalmente más justificadas, más motivadas, más naturales, menos ahogadas por el pampanoso lujo del estilo. En una palabra, hay más verdad y más pasión en Dumas, más drama. Más novedad y más imaginación en Victor Hugo, más poesía. Victor Hugo explota casi siempre una situación verosímil o posible: Dumas una pasión verdadera¹.

Still, these were individual opinions², and to most Spaniards of this epoch Victor Hugo was 'el hombre de genio que se ha adelantado a su siglo, el atrevido innovador que ha concebido y llevado a cabo una revolución en el edificio gótico de la literatura³.' Throughout the years 1836-7 he continued to be exploited in Spain. Leaving aside Madrid, which sponsored most of his plays, his *Angelo*, during 1836, and Ochoa's version of *Hernani*, during 1837, were each produced five times in Barcelona. *Lucrecia Borgia*—'el gran drama colosal romántico del incomparable Victor Hugo⁴'—was given twice at Valencia in 1836 and twice in 1837, and in the latter year eight times at Barcelona. *Marie Tudor*⁵ was played at Valencia on January 26, 1837—but, though described as Hugo's masterpiece, was not repeated. *Hernani*, on the other hand, continued to be represented in Spain every year until 1839⁶.

The novels of Hugo, too, were becoming more popular. It will be remembered that the obsessions of Mesonero Romanos' mythical nephew were caused by the recently translated *Han d'Islande* or *Bug Jargal*.

Hallábase a la sazón meditabundo, los ojos elevados al cielo, la mano derecha en la apagada mejilla y en la izquierda sosteniendo débilmente un libro abierto... libro que según el forro amarillo, su tamaño y demás proporciones, no podía ser otro, a mi entender, que el *Han d'Islandia* o el *Bug Jargal*⁷.

A second version of this last novel came out in 1836-7⁸, and in 1837 appeared González de Velasco's translation of *Marie Tudor*⁹. In 1838, a second version, in five volumes, of *Notre Dame de Paris*¹⁰ was published at Bordeaux, and two versions of *Le Roi s'amuse* appeared in Madrid and

¹ Larra, *ed. cit.*, III, pp. 19-20. Cf. the terser but similar judgment of 'C.A.' in the *Artista* (1835, I, p. 95): 'Alejandro Dumas es sin disputa más dramático que Victor Hugo.'

² For a not dissimilar opinion by the Valencian J. M. Bonilla, see *Diario Mercantil de Valencia*, December 7, 1836.

³ *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1836, I, p. 37.

⁴ The *Diario de Barcelona*, *Guardia Nacional* and *Vapor* do not always agree in their testimony as to the performances of these plays. The figures here given are based on the most conservative estimate possible.

⁵ See Bibliography, No. 11. The fame of this play eventually reached Barcelona, for we read in the *Diario de Barcelona* (September 2, 1837): 'Esta producción sublime que puede llamarse la obra maestra del genio del siglo y que se ha adquirido justamente el primer lugar entre todas las de su género, se representó en el teatro de Valencia a beneficio de D^a Concepción Samaniego, el jueves 26 de enero de 1837. El público la admiró con entusiasmo embelgado de sus bellezas y así el desempeño esmerado de los actores, como su mérito intrínseco, arrancaron de los sensibles espectadores numerosos aplausos.'

⁶ Cf., for details, E. Allison Peers, *El Romanticismo en España*, etc., pp. 23, 24, 39, 40.

⁷ 'El Romanticismo y los Románticos,' in *Escenas Matritenses*, Madrid, 1862, p. 125.

⁸ Cf. Bibliography, No. 7.

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 11.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 12.

Barcelona respectively¹. *Marie Tudor* was also the source of the *María de Inglaterra* published in Madrid in 1839².

In our next article we shall speak in greater detail of the indirect influence of Hugo's poetry in Spain; it is sufficient here to show how little it had penetrated directly³. The *Guardia Nacional* had not been far wrong when it declared, in 1835: 'Como filósofo, como poeta lírico, como novelista, apenas es conocido Victor Hugo entre nosotros⁴.' José María Quadrado, in an article written as late as 1840 to which we shall presently refer, confesses himself unable to judge Victor Hugo as a lyric poet, his *Orientales* (1829) not having yet reached Spain collectively. Only, he continues: 'Si hemos de juzgar por unas muestras y por el aplauso de los literatos, luce en ellas un sentimiento y una poesía verdaderamente oriental⁵.'

On the stage, the year 1838 seems to have witnessed the highest point of Victor Hugo's popularity in Spain. In Barcelona there were six performances of *María Tudor*, five of *Hernani* and three of *Lucrecia Borgia*. Only in Valencia, where Romantic drama in general was less popular than in either of the two larger capitals⁶, was interest beginning to wane. One performance of *Lucrecia Borgia*, one of *Cromwell* and two of *Hernani* can hardly be called a triumph⁷.

During these years Hugo is increasingly being paid the compliments of satire. Mesonero Romanos' tilt at his novels has already been quoted. Bretón pokes fun at *Bug Jargal* and *Notre Dame* in his comedy *El Hombre Pacífico* (1838)⁸ and frequently makes ironic mention of Hugo in his poems⁹. And lesser men follow their lead; though retaining more respect for so great a writer, they are not thereby precluded from indicating his exaggerations, especially when, as in *Hernani*, these have some connexion with their own country.

¹ Bibliography, Nos. 13-14. The Madrid translation is by Ventura de la Vega. A review of it appears in *El Siglo*, 1838, p. 47.

² Cf. Bibliography, No. 15.

³ As will then appear, the testimony of Juan Martínez Villergas ('Tan pronto como se popularizaban las inimitables orientales de Victor Hugo, todo el mundo hizo orientales, etc.,' *Juicio crítico*, etc., p. 189) is as unreliable as his testimony usually is.

⁴ Cf. p. 45, n. 1, above.

⁵ *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1840, v, p. 191. Cf. pp. 55 f. below.

⁶ Cf. E. Allison Peers, *El Romanticismo en España*, etc., pp. 31, 40.

⁷ Soulié's *Clotilde* was given five times, but this was a drama of particular local interest since the Valencian Bonilla had accorded it high praise and compared it with the dramas of Dumas and Hugo.

⁸ I, xvii, where the romantic Casilda excuses herself to her father for falling in love with Don Mamerto:

'Perdón, perdón, padre mío,' etc.

⁹ Notably in *Reputaciones fáciles* and *El Genio... Los Genios*.

III.

The triumph of eclecticism in Spain, which succeeded the brief period of success enjoyed by the so-called Romantic 'movement,' may be said to have begun very soon after the publication of Mesonero Romanos' *El Romanticismo y los Románticos*. The fall of Romanticism in public favour soon dragged down with it the fame of Victor Hugo in Spain. For a year or two the vogue of his plays, which had come so tardily into Spain, continued, and as late as 1840¹ he is still 'the first Romantic genius of the day².' But by 1839 his vogue can be seen to have been distinctly on the wane and by the middle forties it has almost ceased.

In considering Hugo's loss of stage popularity, it must be borne in mind that Donizetti's opera on the theme of *Lucrece Borgia* was being first produced in Spain at just about this time (1839-40): not only does this sometimes make it hard to distinguish whether press notices are referring to Hugo or to Donizetti, but the latter's opera genuinely revived a flagging interest in the former's play. So, when in Barcelona we find Hugo's plays averaging eleven performances annually in 1836-8 against eighteen in 1840, this does not mean that Hugo was becoming more popular, for ten of the eighteen performances are of *Lucrecia Borgia*. The corresponding figures for Dumas are fifteen and thirteen, and for Ducange seven and three. In Madrid and Valencia we have not traced a single representation of Victor Hugo in 1840, though Madrid had twenty-two in 1836-8.

The comparatively small number of translations of Hugo appearing after 1840 emphasises the rapid decline of his popularity. Against twenty-four translations in book form published in the decade 1834-43, we have found eight in the decade following (1844-53) and only five in the third decade (1854-63), beyond which we have thought it unnecessary to carry our Bibliography. The fact that the Romantic fervour of Ochoa diminished perceptibly as Hugo's fame declined will account for the falling-off in the second decade. This decade, though sparsely filled, is interesting. It begins with *Ruy Blas* (1844)³, translated six years after its production in France, and includes the first of Hugo's political works to be turned into Spanish⁴. The latter occasion is celebrated by an instructive preface attempting an apologia for Hugo along lines which we have not yet encountered in this survey.

¹ In 1841 appeared the second edition of Ochoa's translation of *Notre Dame de Paris*. Though several editions of this work had appeared in Spanish, the 1841 re-edition attracted an attention for which we cannot account; several lengthy reviews appeared in the press. Cf. Bibliography, No. 21.

² *El Constitucional*, Feb. 17, 1840, p. 260. (Review of *Nuestra Señora de Paris*.)

³ Bibliography, No. 25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 26.

Séanos permitido consignar cuán torpes a la par que mal intencionados han andado algunos críticos al suponer que iba a menos el ingenio de Victor Hugo. Muy al contrario, comparando fechas y producciones, fácilmente se echa de ver un progreso constante en el brío y robustez de su inteligencia siempre más admirable por su elevación y grandeza. Por consiguiente, bien puede ahora sonreírse el ilustre par de Francia por el estúpido y vil clamoreo de aquellos envidiosos que le trataban hasta de loco cuando más esplendorosamente se iba remontando su espíritu¹.

Other translations of the second decade are versions of *Napoléon le Petit*² (1852), and a 'gran baile dramático' entitled *La Esmeralda* (1849), adapted from *Notre Dame de Paris*³. Clearly these are the curiosities of Hugo's vogue, and another indication that his work as a dramatist, novelist and poet in Spain was over.

It may be observed that *Les Burgraves*, produced in French when Hugo's Spanish popularity was already waning (1843), was never translated, and also that, though *Cromwell* was represented in Spain at least once⁴, neither play nor preface seems to have appeared in Spanish.

IV.

Contemporary references to Victor Hugo during the period of his declining vogue in Spain might well suggest a formal comparison and contrast between his influence and that of Chateaubriand. This we are precluded from making by limits of space, and indeed it may readily be inferred from this article and two others which we have already cited⁵. We may appropriately preface the last part of our summary, however, by quoting from a contrast between Chateaubriand and Hugo drawn by José Ferrer y Subirana and published in *La Civilización* for 1843. We can excerpt but one passage from an article of over forty pages, but it will be found sufficiently expressive:

He aquí el contraste que ofrecen el genio de Chateaubriand y el de Victor Hugo, y que en todas sus obras sobresa. El género de Chateaubriand es lo bello y lo sublime: sus producciones nos encantan, o excitan nuestra admiración y asombro. El género de Victor Hugo es lo feo y lo horrible: la lectura de sus romances y la vista de sus dramas nos repugna y estremece. Lo grande y lo hermoso en el orden físico y moral, he aquí lo que os presenta, he aquí lo que canta la musa del poeta cristiano: las deformidades físicas y las deformidades morales; envenenamientos, crímenes, espías, prostitutas, monstruos, todo lo que hace erizar los cabellos y helar la sangre, esto encontraréis en las producciones de Victor Hugo. Leed el *Han d'Islandia*, leed el *Último Día de un Ajusticiado*, leed su obra monumental asombrosa por la luz vibrante de las descripciones y el grandor extraordinario del genio, *Nuestra Señora de Paris*, asistid al espectáculo de *Lucrecia Borgia*, y decidnos después las veces que la sangre parece que se os helaba de horror, y si vuestro corazón ha sentido más de un cruel y frío estremecimiento.

So in the 1840's did a critic write of the mild forerunner of the French Romantics and contrast him with their vociferous protagonist. We soon

¹ *Diario*, etc., ed. cit., p. 98.

² Bibliography, No. 31.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 28.

⁴ See p. 48 above.

⁵ Cf. p. 38, n. 2, above.

discover that similar sentiments prevail in nearly every direction. The satires upon Hugo published after the triumph of eclecticism become sharper and more determined, often reaching the point of fierce denunciation. Already, in 1838, a journalist had written of Hugo's plays 'que ya no arrancan lágrimas ni mueven a risa, pero sí a fastidio y aun náusea¹.' In the next year came an open attack, from no less a writer than Zorrilla, who, in the preface to *Cada cual con su razón* (August 27, 1839), wrote thus:

El autor de *Cada cual con su razón* no se ha tenido jamás por poeta dramático. Pero indignado al ver nuestra escena nacional invadida por los monstruosos abortos de la elegante corte de Francia, ha buscado en Calderón, en Lope y en Tirso de Molina, recursos y personajes que en nada recuerdan a *Hernani* y *Lucrecia Borgia*. Y por si de estas sus creencias literarias se les antojara a sus amigos o a sus detractores señalarle como partidario de escuela alguna, les aconseja que no se cansen en volver a sacar a plaza la ya mohosa cuestión de clasicismo y romanticismo.

After declaring that the Classicists will be satisfied with his work, since all three unities are observed, he goes on to say:

Los señores románticos perdonarán que no haya en ella verdugos, esqueletos, anatemas ni asesinatos. Pero aun puede remediarse. Tómese cualquiera la molestia de corregir la escena final, y con que el Marqués dé a su hija un verdadero veneno, con que él apure después el soberano licor que en el vaso quede, con que el rey dé una estocada a Don Pedro y la dueña se tire por el balcón, no restará más que hacer sino avisar a la parroquia de San Sebastián y pagar a los curas los responsos y a los sepultureros su viaje al cementerio de la puerta de Fuencarral.

The vogue of revolutionary Hugoesque drama was rapidly yielding ground before the persistently expressed desire of the Romantic revivalists to return to the Siglo de Oro. The Hugoesque determination to shock the Classicists was yielding to the eclectics' desire to conciliate them. Salvador Bermúdez de Castro declared that Spaniards should cease for ever to imitate Victor Hugo and other French dramatists who had wrought the stage nothing but harm². Miguel Agustín Príncipe, director of the periodical *El Entreacto* (1839), wrote a *letrilla* in it, entitled 'El bajón romántico,' defending the national theatre and opposing the immorality of the modern Romantic drama. One of its verses runs as follows:

Quede la moralidad
para la pasada edad;
que a nosotros en verdad
nos cupo otra sociedad.
Borgia... Antony... Marión...
los tipos del arte son,
la acabada creación
del romántico bajón.
¡ Maldición !³

¹ *Nosotros*, 1838, p. 12, *cit.* Le Gentil, *Les Revues littéraires*, etc., p. 83.

² *El Iris*, 1841, *cit.* Alonso Cortés, *op. cit.*, I, p. 232.

³ This *letrilla*, with some other interesting and little known satires on Romanticism, will be found in *Poesías de D. Miguel Agustín Príncipe*, Madrid, 1840. (*Letrilla XIII*, I, pp. 240-6.)

Ventura de la Vega, in 1842, actually attacked Hugo in his inaugural address before the Spanish Academy.

Tremenda agresión, a cuyo frente marchaba ese Atila de las letras, arrojado como aquel fanático, poderoso fascinador, que llamándose también a sí propio apóstol del Pindo, juntó numerosa hueste, embistió a las estatuas de Corneille, Racine y Molière, que resistieron firmes el bárbaro empuje. En extendiendo su brazo hasta nosotros quiso también arrojar sobre las floridas y apacibles campiñas de la poesía castellana los espectros fantásticos y los nefandos crímenes que engendra allá en tétricas imaginaciones el cielo encapotado del Septentrión....¹

He points out how Romanticism found its greatest scope in the drama; and how 'los monstruosos dramas de Victor Hugo y Dumas' were ardently supported by the 'vulgo espectador.' He attributes this last fact to the political unrest of the country; for the public, agitated by war and the uncertainty of the future, 'no se hallaba en aquel estado de apacible sosiego que era necesario para que pudiese recibir en el teatro impresiones delicadamente tiernas².' He considers all French Romantic dramas to be alike, both morally and dramatically. To present, as in *Antony*, an ardent and lofty soul, ambitious for glory, and to imprison it in a lowly and humiliating environment, where it is conscious of nothing but the decadence of mankind, is, he says, sufficient to inspire hatred for humanity. 'O bien,' he goes on to say, 'presentar una deformidad moral unida a una belleza física, como en Lucrecia Borgia, o *vice versa* como en Triboulet; de este modo se inspira odio a la Providencia³.'

It should be noted that Zorrilla was a good Romantic, and that Bermúdez de Castro, Príncipe and Vega⁴ were, at the least, distinctly liberal eclectics. Were we to add the diatribes against Victor Hugo written by such conservatives as Javier de Burgos⁵, José Joaquín de Mora⁶ and Alberto Lista⁷, the space at our disposal would at once be exhausted.

Even in the satires of the good-natured *Curioso Parlante* and the usually good-natured Bretón we begin to detect a note of asperity. Compare, for instance, the tone of *El Romanticismo y los Románticos* with that of an article in the *Semanario Pintoresco* for 1839, on the Novel.

Fuerza es repetirlo: a tan criminal empeño, a tan formidable resultado, conspira hoy la novela en las emponzoñadas plumas de los Hugos y Dumas, Balzac, Sand y Soulié; admiremos su peregrino ingenio y las galas abundantes de su estilo; pero si estimamos en algo las costumbres austeras de nuestra patria, si participamos y respetamos de su creencia religiosa, si nos sentimos animados de un noble entusiasmo al poder expresar

¹ *Discurso*, etc., p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 99.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴ Vega, indeed, confesses in the *Discurso* that, but for the 'sana doctrina' of Lista, he would have become a Romantic.

⁵ *El Panorama*, cit. Le Gentil, *Les Revues littéraires*, etc., p. 88.

⁶ E.g., *Poesías*, Madrid, 1853, pp. 188, 284, 371. Note in particular the sonnet to Hugo (p. 188).

⁷ E.g., *Ensayos Literarios y Críticos*, Seville, 1844, *passim*.

nuestras ideas en el armonioso lenguaje de Cervantes, no pretendamos imitar tan inmorales extravíos¹.

And Bretón, about the same time as that well-known sonnet in which he explains the secret of his domestic bliss,

Mi mujer no ha leído a Victor Hugo,
Ni voy yo a los cafés: he aquí el secreto²,

indulges in a more trenchant satire of Hugo than he had done previously:

¡Mofarse del santo yugo
de un modo tan inmoral!
¡Intriga tan infernal
es digna de Victor Hugo!³

Though Fermín Gonzalo Morón is more classically-inclined an eclectic than either Mesonero or Bretón⁴, it may not be unfair to quote his judgment on Hugo's Romanticism. He is tracing the course of the Romantic movement in France:

Descollaron en esta nueva carrera Victor Hugo y Alejandro Dumas, de ardiente y acalorada fantasía y dotados de bastante numen para acreditar extravíos y excesos, dignos de severa reprobación. El primero sobre todo hizo como público y orgulloso alarde de despreciar, no sólo las reglas del arte, sino aun las de la moral y del decoro.

Victor Hugo's novel, *Notre Dame de Paris*, was the *Iliad* of this new literature, which obtained for its author extraordinary and unmerited renown. The critic is vehement in his disapproval and denunciation of this work. The beauty of its dialogue and of many of its scenes can never atone for the fundamental defects to be found in it; in the descriptions of characters and passions, and in the disagreeable and harmful impression it is bound to produce upon the reader's mind. No 'hombre honrado,' he exclaims, could read it without feeling disgust at the display of the animal-like passions of man; at the author's idea that he can only move his reader by conducting him to gallows and sepulchres, and by painting in exaggerated and false colouring all the weaknesses of human nature. We are not Classicists, Gonzalo Morón goes on to say:

No admitimos nosotros en manera alguna la estrecha órbita de los preceptistas; pero esto no nos impedirá levantar, indignados, una voz de tremenda censura, y de acerba reprobación contra los extravíos de la nueva escuela, y decir a sus jefes y sectarios, que han elegido una carrera en que será escasa su gloria, mientras su nombre puede ser titulado con negro borrón por los contemporáneos, y más aún por la posteridad. Las composiciones de este género...pararán anatematizadas a la posteridad, después de haber sido un objeto de escándalo para los contemporáneos.

He regrets that Spain should have come under the influence of this new

¹ *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1839, p. 255.

² *Obras*, Madrid, 1883, I, p. x.

³ *Dios los crea y ellos se juntan* (1841), III, viii.

⁴ We think this a not unfair description of his position. But M. Le Gentil has examined it more exactly in *Les Revues littéraires*, pp. 121-3.

school, declaring that the doctrine and extravagances of this Romanticism were altogether contrary to the 'genio español¹.'

Many critics, of course, during the whole of this period, could be found to defend Victor Hugo. Vera e Isla (Gil y Carrasco's editor) extolled Hugo's 'tonos sublimes²,' and insisted upon the morality of his writings, which Lista in particular had attacked. The *Semanario Pintoresco* has a number of apologies. To one of them, Quadrado's, we shall presently return³. Another is by the less-known Diego Coello y Quesada, to whom Hugo is a 'poeta de genio y de talento,' 'inspirado y entusiasta.' *Hernani*, with all its defects, is a 'magnífica novela dramática de Calderón,' the 'brillante reflejo del drama de Corneille.' But the genius of Hugo, who might have been another Corneille (*sic*), met with an untimely death.

El aire de la capital de la Francia secó las fuentes de purísima poesía que abrigaba en su corazón uno de los más grandes e inspirados poetas del siglo XIX, y difícil será reconocer hoy en el autor de las *Voix intérieures* y de *El Rey se divierte*, el poeta de las *Odas* y *Orientales*, el autor de *Hernani*. El drama se ha hecho político y la política mata la poesía⁴.

Though the literary atmosphere of Barcelona was unfavourable to a prolonged Hugo-worship⁵, we have seen that in 1840 he was 'el primer genio romántico del día⁶'; in the same year *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné* is described as 'Una de las más preciosas joyas que adornan la moderna literatura francesa. El lector siente oprimido su corazón, se entenece y llora⁷.' The Mallorcan review *La Palma*, edited by Quadrado, which in 1840 reprinted his article, together with a review of Arolas' *Orientales*⁸, continued during 1841 to fan such flame of enthusiasm as still burned in that distant part of Spain by printing translations of Hugo's poems⁹.

We have not, of course, been able to cite more than the most important of the references to Hugo which occur during the period of his waning influence; but we believe these to be fairly representative of the rest. When we find him attacked, not only by the conservatives, but by Zorrilla the Romantic and by eclectics like Bermúdez de Castro, Ventura de la Vega, Mesonero Romanos and Bretón, and defended only by a few

¹ *Revista de España y del Extranjero*, 1842, II, p. 188. Gonzalo Morón was editor of this review from 1842 to 1844.

² *No me olvides*, 1837, *cit.* Alonso Cortés, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 224-5.

³ *Cf.* pp. 55 f.

⁴ *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1840, V, p. 199.

⁵ *Cf.* E. Allison Peers, *El Romanticismo en España*, etc., p. 16.

⁶ *Cf.* p. 49 above, and *Diario de Barcelona*, February 18, 1840.

⁷ *Ibid.* (February 6, 1840).

⁸ To these we shall return in our second article.

⁹ *E.g.* (January, 1841), Quadrado's version of the *ballade* 'Le pas d'armes du roi Jean' ('Torneo del rey Juan').

minor authors of whom the best known is Vera e Isla¹, it is very clear how completely the current has turned against him.

One notable critical article, however, has not yet been quoted, that of José María Quadrado, entitled 'Victor Hugo y su escuela literaria' (1839)². We know none of Quadrado's other critical writings in which he is more strikingly in advance of his age or displays more sagacity, insight and fairness. For this reason, and also because it is historical as well as critical, we have left it till last in this survey.

Quadrado's main thesis is the important rôle played in literary criticism by the element of reaction. To-morrow's exaggerations arise from the abuses of to-day: 'es viejo lo de ayer.' This is the explanation of Victor Hugo's changing fortunes.

Tal se nos presenta Victor Hugo, jefe de la moderna escuela de literatura, ayer adorado como un dios, y hoy condenado sin defensa por muchos literatos; ayer león triunfante que estremecía las selvas con su rugido y hoy conculcado en el polvo aguardando sólo la cox del asno para expirar³.

When Hugo, he continues, first became famous five years previously⁴, he was considered to be the Messiah of the new generation. These emancipators of poetry, with Hugo at their head, believed they had a social mission to perform with regard to it. Mistakenly, as we think, Quadrado attributes Hugo's fall and the fall of Spanish Romanticism to the articles of Lista, who constantly and persistently warned the young dramatists of the day against the imitation of the French Romanticists.

He well points out, however, that Hugo is held responsible for the exaggerations of Romanticism, for all its excesses and monstrosities:

Pero como si hubiese prohibido Victor Hugo los abortos todos de algunos cerebros febriles, sobre él ha recaído principalmente toda la hiel y violencia de la reacción; se le ha designado como jefe de un club de jacobinos literarios y como padre de una escuela infernal y desorganizadora, y no han aparecido, desde algún tiempo acá, sepulcrales coplas, romances del feudalismo y escena de veneno o pañal, de que no se le haya hecho responsable⁵.

For many, Victor Hugo's Romanticism 'es una cosa tan rancia'; and the word 'rancia,' continues Quadrado, is the severest censure upon anything—is indeed its sentence of death—in this century of innovations.

After defending Hugo against the charge of immorality, and awarding the palm among his works to *Notre Dame de Paris*⁶, the critic discusses his

¹ Unless one counts the once-romantic Hartzenbusch's defence of Hugo (*Ensayos políticos y artículos en prosa*, Madrid, 1843, pp. 215-28) in which he upholds him for not having seriously violated the dramatic unities!

² It was written in 1839 but published in the *Semanario Pintoresco* for 1840 (v, pp. 189-92), as also in *La Palma* of the same date.

³ Quadrado, *art. cit.*, p. 189.

⁴ The date should be noted, as corresponding with that which we have adopted above (p. 40). The passage is quoted on p. 56 below.

⁵ Quadrado, *art. cit.*, p. 189.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

dramas, which (with evident reference to Lista¹) he calls anti-monarchical rather than immoral, and asks that judgment should be done to him:

Quisiéramos que guardaran nuestros literatos, si no mayor veneración, mayor gratitud al menos con aquel que abrió en su corazón tantas fuentes de poesía, a quien deben tantos castillos almenados, tantas góticas catedrales, tantas pálidas y aéreas hermosuras, y cuyo yugo sin querer, y quizá sin saberlo, pese todavía sobre su imaginación.

He then concludes with a striking passage which is at once history and prophecy and must be quoted in full:

Cuando llegue a la posteridad (porque llegará sin duda) el nombre de Victor Hugo, se dudará que en cinco años haya sido sucesivamente reputado como Mesías regenerador del mundo y de la poesía y como Antecristo de la literatura aparecido en días de sangre y de decadencia para anunciarle su ruina; se burlarán de tan ridícula apoteosis y de declamación tan furibunda, y no se comprenderá esta especie de maniqueísmo literario del día, según el que se atribuye al poeta francés cuanto hay de malo y deforme, y cuanto de bueno y perfecto existe se hace proceder de Calderón. La posteridad a quien pasarán las obras de entrambos, y cuyo juicio afortunadamente por este motivo no podrá prevenirse, juzgándolas por sus defectos y bellezas, dirá: que Victor Hugo fué de una imaginación vivísima, y que a veces por exaltada puede parecer delirante; de harta tendencia a lo tétrico, y horrible, aunque no escéptico ni sardónico en su melancolía; en la animación de los seres insensibles y relaciones del hombre con la naturaleza, sin par ni semejante; gran conocedor del corazón humano, especialmente en las grandes luchas y grandes afectos; en las situaciones, más feliz que en la invención de caracteres o en la disposición o trama de la acción; en los sentimientos casi siempre asombrosamente natural; en la expresión de ellos inimitable.

V.

We believe that we have now made clear the nature of Victor Hugo's vogue in Spain, which, though it seems never before to have been described both explicitly and fully, emerges very distinctly when the evidence is submitted to careful investigation. We summarise briefly our main conclusions.

Partly, perhaps, from political and social causes, but chiefly for unexplained reasons, Victor Hugo hardly became known in Spain at all widely before 1834, the first year in which a long work of his was translated. Almost immediately afterwards, with the sudden but short popularity of Romantic drama, he leapt into fame, and for some four years (c. 1835-8) was one of the most discussed foreign authors in the Peninsula. But, before the end of this period, there were signs that his reputation was fading, and, from 1839 until he sank into insignificance about 1845, he was subjected to frequent and varied attacks, from critics of all parties and critics of none, his defenders being comparatively few and for the most part insignificant. The substantial available evidence for

¹ Lista's notorious article 'De lo que hoy llamamos romanticismo,' condemning the movement as 'antimonárquico, antirreligioso y antimoral,' had been published in the *Semanario* for 1839 (iv, p. 102).

these conclusions is confirmed by the explicit testimony of an unprejudiced critic, J. M. Quadrado.

We have used the word 'vogue' to denote influence of a general kind which can be estimated from a comparatively superficial examination of documents covering the period under survey. There is, however, an influence, at once subtler and broader, which penetrates below the surface levels of translation, representation and direct outspoken criticism, and reaches the underground currents of imitation, adaptation and the indirect (perhaps even unconscious) permeation of ideas. Impossible as this may be to estimate with any precision where an author has so much in common with his contemporaries as had Victor Hugo, we shall endeavour to gauge it in our two following articles, partly because we can thus adduce new data to support the conclusions reached in these pages and partly in order to discover what elements of permanence existed in Victor Hugo's 'influence' which were not present in his 'vogue.' In these articles we shall first deal with the influence on poetry and prose fiction and finally with that on drama.

ADELAIDE PARKER.
E. ALLISON PEERS.

LIVERPOOL.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

HORACE WALPOLE'S MEMOIR OF THE POET GRAY.

The original of the following memoir of Gray by Horace Walpole is preserved in *A Common Place Book of Verses, Stories, Characters, Letters, etc., etc., with some particular Memoirs of a certain Parcel of People*, in Walpole's handwriting, dated 1740, in the Collection of the Earl Waldegrave, at Chewton Priory, Bath. The memoir, very inaccurately printed, was prefixed by Mitford to his edition of *The Correspondence of Thomas Gray and William Mason* (London, 1853), pp. xxxi-iv. In his Preface (p. xxviii) Mitford says:

I present my readers with some brief notes on Gray by the hand of Walpole; I do not know the time when they were written. They are indeed very unfinished, and seem to have been composed in haste; but they have added something to our knowledge of the Poet's history, and they acquire an authentic value from the quarter from which they come.

But he gives no indication of the source from which he derived them. Either he was supplied with a faulty transcript, or (which is more probable) the faults are due to his own carelessness as a transcriber. The text is now for the first time printed as it was written by Walpole, Mitford's numerous inaccuracies (other than his disregard of Walpole's punctuation, use of capitals, etc.) being noted as they occur.

MR. THOMAS GRAY.

He was son of a money scrivener, by Mary Antrobus a milliner in Cornhill, and sister to two Antrobus's who were ushers of Eton School. He was born in 1716, & educated at Eton College, chiefly under the direction of one of his uncles, who took prodigious pains with him, which answered exceedingly. He particularly instructed him in the virtues of simples¹. He had a great genius for music & poetry. From Eton, he went to Peterhouse in² Cambridge, & in 1739 accompanied Mr H. W. in travels³ to France and Italy. He returned in 1741, & retired⁴ to Cambridge again. His letters were⁵ the best I ever saw, & had more novelty & wit. One of his first pieces of poetry was an answer in English verse to an Epistle from H. W.⁶ At Naples he wrote a fragment describing

¹ Mitford: 'simples.'

² M.: 'Peter House at.'

³ M.: 'travelling.'

⁴ M.: 'returned.'

⁵ M.: 'are'—from the fact that Walpole wrote 'were,' not 'are,' it is evident that the memoir was written after Gray's death.

⁶ M. notes: 'This poem I do not know.' The piece in question was discovered by me, in Gray's hand, in the Waller Collection at Woodcote, Warwick, and was printed in my *Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West, and Ashton* (Oxford, 1915), i, pp. 13-15.

an earthquake & the origin of Monte Nuovo in the style of Virgil, & at Rome an Alcaic ode in imitation of Horace to Richard¹ West Esq. After his return he wrote that² inimitable Ode on a distant Prospect of Eton College; another Moral Ode, & that beautiful one on a cat of Mr H.W.'s³ drowned in a tub of gold fishes. These three last have been published in Dodsley's Miscellanies. He began a poem on the Reformation of Learning, but soon dropped it, on finding his plan had too much resemblance to⁴ the Dunciad. It had this admirable line in it,

And Gospel-light first flash'd⁵ from Bullen's eyes.

He began too a philosophical poem in Latin, & an English tragedy of Agrippina, & some other odes, one of which, a very beautiful one, intitled *Stanzas written in a Country Churchyard*⁶, he finished in 1750. He was a very slow but very correct writer. Being at Stoke in the summer of 1750, he wrote a kind of tale, addressed to Lady Schaub & Miss Speed, who had made him a visit from⁷ Lady Cobham's.

The Elegy written in the Churchyard was printed⁸ by Dodsley Feb. 16 1751 with a short advertisement by Mr H. W., and immediately went through four editions. He had some thoughts of taking his doctor's degree, but would not, for fear of being confounded with Dr Grey, who published the foolish edition of Hudibras. In March 1753 was published a fine edition of Six⁹ of his poems, with frontispieces, head and tail pieces, & initial letters, engraved by Grignion & Müller after designs¹⁰ by Richard Bentley Esq. He lost his mother a little before this, & about¹¹ the same time finished an extreme fine poem, in imitation of Pindar, on the power of musical poetry, which he had begun¹² two or three years before.

In the winter of 1755, George Hervey, Earl of Bristol, who was soon afterwards sent Envoy to Turin, was designed for Minister to Lisbon; he offered to carry Mr Gray as his secretary, but he refused¹³ it.

In August 1757 were¹⁴ published two odes by¹⁵ Mr Gray, one on the power and progress of Poetry¹⁶, the other on the destruction of the Welsh Bards by Edward 1st. They were printed at the new press at Strawberry hill, being the first productions¹⁷ of that printing-house.

In Oct. 1761, he made words for an old tune of Geminiani, at the

¹ M.: 'R.'

⁴ M.: 'his plan too much resembling.'

⁶⁻⁸ M. ignores italics.

⁹ M. omits 'of Six.'

¹² M.: 'he began.'

¹⁵ M.: 'of.'

² M.: 'the.'

⁷ M.: 'at.'

¹⁰ M.: 'drawings.'

¹³ M.: 'declined.'

¹⁶ M.: 'Poesy.'

³ M.: 'Mr Walpole's.'

⁵ M. italicizes *flashed* only.

⁸ M.: 'published.'

¹¹ M.: 'at.'

¹⁴ M.: 'was.'

¹⁷ M.: 'production.'

request of Miss¹ Speed; it begins, 'Thyrsis, when we parted, swore' etc.² two stanzas;³ the thought from the French⁴.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

BURNHAM, BUCKS.

GRAY ON THE ORIGIN AND DATE OF 'AMADIS DE GAUL.'

The following note in Gray's hand on the origin and date of *Amadis de Gaul* was discovered by me recently among the Gray MSS. kindly placed at my disposal by their present owner, Mr A. T. Loyd, of Lockinge. So far as I am aware, it has not hitherto been printed. It is here reproduced as written, with Gray's characteristic punctuation, use of capitals, etc., save for the division of the text into paragraphs, and the addition of a few notes. There is nothing to show the date at which it was written.

Amadis de Gaul is esteem'd by Mic. Cervantes (Don Quixotte, V: l. C: 6) the first book of Chivalry, that was ever printed in Spain, & the best Book of its kind, that was ever written⁵. the Author of it in the Spanish tongue, who lived soon after the Conquest of Granada⁶ by Ferdinand & Isabella, as appears from his own Preface (that is, in y^e latter part of the 15th Century) does not call his work an Original, but professes only to have corrected the three first books w^{ch} by the fault of the Writers (I suppose, he means Transcribers) & of *Translators* had been much corrupted & vitiated before his time, & to have translated the 4th, & 5th books. w^{ch} last he pretends as discover'd, written on an ancient parchment, under a stone in a hermitage near Constantinople. it is therefore probable, that this last book was of his own invention, & perhaps a part of the 4th, for it is to be observed, that the History of Amadis & Oriana ends very naturally at the 31st Chapter. these four first books, I imagine, are the 4 Volumes, w^{ch} Cervantes so highly commends, for the succeeding books contain the Adventures of Esplandian, of Amadis de Greece, &c: w^{ch} he condemns to the flames for their extravagance & folly.

It seems as if the Original Amadis (whether it were in the Portuguese Tongue, or whatever other language) bore the name of a Prince of Portugal, as its Author, for the Spanish Translator & Correcter (L. l. C: 41.) says, *Toutefois le Seigneur Infant de Portugal a voulu deguiser l'histoire &c: mais cette histoire ét fainte & mensongere.* Des Efsars⁷, who in the beginning of the 16th Century translated the Spanish Amadis into French imagines, that the Original was in that Tongue, & affirms, that he has seen a very ancient Manuscript of it in the Dialect of Picardy. it is certain, that Dante in his treatise De vulgari eloquentiâ, written early in the 14th Century, looks upon the

¹ M.: 'Mrs.' ² M. omits '&c.'

³ M. here inserts....

⁴ At the end of the memoir M. inserts * * * as if the MS. was a fragment, of which there is no indication.

⁵ 'El primero [libro], que Maese Nicolas le [i.e. al Cura] dio en las manos, fue los Quatro de Amadis de Gaula. Y dixo el Cura: Parece cosa de misterio esta, porque segun he oido decir, este libro fue el primero de caballerias, que se imprimio en España, y todos los demas han tomado principio y origen deste; y así me parece, que como a dogmatizador de una seta tan mala, le debemos sin escusa alguna condenar al fuego. No señor, dixo el Barbero, que tambien he oido decir, que es el mejor de todos los libros, que de este genero se han compuesto; y así como a unico en su arte se debe perdonar. Así es verdad, dixo el Cura, y por esa razon se le otorga la vida por ahora.' (*Don Quixote*, Parte i, Cap. vi.)

⁶ In 1492.

⁷ Nicolas d'Herberay des Essarts (d. c. 1552) translated the first eight books into French (Paris, 1540-8, fol.) at the instance of Francis-I.

French Nation as the Inventors of Romances in Prose¹, there are still extant French Romances in verse as old, as the year 1154, & the *Mirroir of Knighthood*, the *Death of Arthur* &c: w^{ch} are in prose, (tho' their age has never, that I know, been accurately enquired into,) are doubtless Works of a very remote antiquity.

There are, I think, in the *Amadis* many internal marks, that prove it of much later invention. the quarrel between Cildadan, King of Ireland, & Lisuarte, King of Great-Britain (L. 2. C: 11) where it is said, 'Combien que de tout tems le Royaume d'Irlande soit tributaire aus Roys de la Grand' Bretagne, neantmoins ce Cildadan refuse le paiement,' &c: shews manifestly, that this work was wrote long after the Conquest of Ireland by Henry the 2^d. the making Arban, King of *Norgales* (North-Wales) not only a Tributary, but Captain of the Guard to the K: of Gr: Britain, shews, that it is posterior to Edward the first, who subdued that country.

There is a pafsage (L. 2. C: 20) w^{ch} makes it evident, that it is not so old as the reign of Edward 3^d. De tout tems il y a eu grand' controversie entre le royaume de Gaule & celui de la Gr: Bretagne, pour ce que les Rois vos predecesseurs y ont toujours pretendu droit de souveraineté, & combien que depuis quelque tems cette querelle soit afsopie, si ét il vraysemblable, que les Gaulois (rememoratifs des guerres & dommages qu'ils ont enduré de vos sujets) deliberent secretement en leurs courages d'eus en venger. before the reign of that King no English Monarch ever pretended a right to the Crown of France, & perhaps this pafsage may serve to fix the age of *Amadis* somewhere between the reigns of Edward the 3^d, & Henry 5th, when the quarrel with France broke out again.

Another circumstance, w^{ch} shews it posterior to Edw^d the 3^d, is the frequent mention of the Castle of Vindilisore (Windsor) where K: Lisuarte & all his Knights pafs'd so much of their time, & of Windsor-Forest (L. 1. C: 24) laquelle estoit bien fournie de toutes sortes de bêtes roufies, & autres propres au deduit de la venerie. this Castle was not a place of royal residence, till Edward made it so, & instituted his order of the Garter there². 'tis true the Author does not shew much knowledge in Geography when he makes Windsor a Sea-port & an Island, yet he shews himself better acquainted with this country than with any other. he mentions London frequently, Bristoye (Bristol) w^{ch} he calls a Port, but seems to imagine it situated on the coast opposite to France. he speaks of the Earls of Clare, Gloucester, &c: &c: tho' he names abundance of fictitious places in this Island, as Sobradise, Tagades, Mirefleur, Sansuogues, Gracedoine (the two latter may perhaps be Sandwich, & Gravesend) yet in Scotland, Denmark, Ireland, France, Bohemia, &c: he scarce gives us one real name, except (L. 3. C: 2) Normandy, la petite Bretagne, Monstreil (Monstreuil in Picardy) where *Amadis* & Galaor landed when they came out of Gr: Britain, & says, this City lay the nearest of any in Gaul to that Island.

From L. 1. C: 11 it appears, that *Amadis* is more modern than the Romance of *Tristram & Isotta*, & from the frequent mention of Ulysses, Turnus, Æneas, Hannibal, Alexander, Cæsar, &c: that the Writer had some acquaintance with ancient History, & classical Authors. particularly the Soliloquy of *Grasinda*, when she falls in love with the Knight of the green Sword (*Amadis*) appears to be a direct imitation of *Dido's* in the 4th *Æneid* (see L. 3. C: 9).

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

¹ 'Allegat pro se lingua oīl, quod propter sui faciliorem ac delectabiliorem vulgaritatem, quicquid redactum sive inventum est ad vulgare prosaicum, suum est: videlicet biblia cum Troianorum Romanorumque gestibus compilata, et Arturi regis ambages pulcerrimae, et quam plures aliae historiae ac doctrinae' (*Vulg. Eloq.*, i, 10, 12-20).

This passage is quoted textually by Gray in a note to his *Observations on the Pseudo-Rhythmus*, written in 1760-1. This, so far as is known, is the earliest quotation from the *De Vulgari Eloquentiā* in English literature.

² In 1344 Edward III projected a plan for the formation of an order of Knighthood, which was carried out on St George's day, April 23, 1349, by the institution of the Order of the Garter. In connexion with the foundation of the order the chapel of Windsor was rebuilt and dedicated to St George.

A DISPUTED READING IN 'AUCASSIN ET NICOLETTE,' § 1, 2.

In the second line of the first *laisse* of *Aucassin et Nicolette* it has been customary to read: 'Del deport du viel antif.' The first to read *antif* was Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye. Méon, however, in his edition of Barbazan's *Fabliaux et contes des Poètes françois*, transcribed the word as *caitif* and added the note: 'M. de Sainte-Palaye a copié *antif*, mais il n'existe pas dans le manuscrit.' Suchier suggested that the two words should read *duel caitif*. Schulze, reviewing Suchier's fourth edition in the *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, cii, p. 224, revived Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye's reading *antif*. With the latter Gaston Paris, *Romania*, xxix, p. 288, agreed and further conjectured *tens antif* as the original reading. Neither of these guesses seems acceptable. Suchier's 'Del deport du duel caitif' does not to my mind make very good sense; the German scholar altered it later to *viel antif*. There is no ground for Gaston Paris's conjecture, *tens antif*, in the matter of the poem. Bourdillon in his note to this line admits that the MS. reads equally well as *antif* or *caitif*, but, influenced by his great respect for Gaston Paris, he prints *viel antif* in his text. His interpretation is 'ancient old man,' and he adds that 'the author of *Aucassin* seems to have been quite equal to treating words and phrases according to his own pleasure,' a note the precise truth of which seems to point to *caitif* as the better reading. Méon, in his note to Barbazan's *Fabliaux et contes*, wrote concerning Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye's transcription *antif*, 'il ne signifieroit rien ici, puisqu'il ne seroit que la répétition du mot précédent; il (Saint-Palaye) en convient lui-même dans sa copie qui est à la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.' Certainly *viel antif* is a senseless redundancy, in spite of Schulze's comparison with *vielantif*, the name of Roland's horse. Why not take it that the author meant *caitif* as a substantive equivalent to Latin 'captive' and not as an adjective, Italian 'cattivo'? It is not at all improbable that the author was a 'paynim' who had been led captive in some such expeditions as those of St Louis. Many things point to the possible truth of this. Fauriel, in his *Histoire de la Poésie provençale*, iii, p. 183, pointed out that the intermingling of prose and verse which is a distinctive feature of this work is characteristic also of Arabian romances. Bourdillon thinks the musical accompaniment has a foreign spirit. Expressions such as 'a miramie,' 'amuaffle,' 'cantefable' are not the spontaneous creations of a native Frenchman. Deliberate, volitional word coinage seems to have been at a discount among thirteenth-century French poets. The examples cited betray foreign, probably Arabian origin. The name *Aucassin* itself is no

more than a transportation into French of al-Kâsim, the name of a Moorish King of Cordova. The confused form 's'arestit' = 's'aresta'; the confusion of 'ce' and 'je' in § 10, where we find in the MS. *je voil je = ce voil je* and *ce sui molt dolans = je sui molt dolans* and which is probably due to the fact that the author did not differentiate his pronunciation of the two words; the troubled syntax of § 7, 12, § 10, 28, § 10, 48-53 (Bourdillon's edition); all of these points lend weight to this view. Further there is, § 14, 21, the peculiarly confused form *cateron* = 'a nipple,' where the author seems to have confused *teteron* (vid. Andresen's conjecture, *Zeitschrift f. romanische Phil.*, xiv, p. 175) with a form having 'caput' as the root.

It seems then within the bounds of probability that the work may be due to some captive minstrel, possibly an Arab, who sang and recited his story in the Picard tongue in the hall of one of the Northern French barons. French would not have been very difficult for him to acquire, as he would certainly have already known some form of 'lingua franca.' The slipshod and hurried state of the handwriting in the MS. might very well indicate that the poem had been taken down orally by a Frenchman, for the MS. occurs in a miscellaneous collection including the *Lais* and the *Fables* of Marie de France, the *Image dou Monde* of Gautier de Metz, and several fabliaux, compiled it would seem by, or for, a French professional minstrel. Considerations such as these make *caitif* appear a better reading than the redundant *antif*.

J. KILLA WILLIAMS.

ABERYSTWYTH.

AN UNKNOWN MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN 'TAGELIET.'

The lament of lovers parted by the break of dawn, most famous in English letters through Shakespeare's handling of the theme in *Romeo and Juliet*, Act III, sc. v, has a long history in German literature¹. There we meet the *tageliet* well before 1200, it is cultivated by most lyric poets of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and ultimately, together with other song-tradition, it passes over into popular poetry where it is kept alive right down to the present day in many a *Volkslied*.

In its earliest form the *tageliet* knows nothing of the watchman (*Wächter*). Only three songs of that type have been preserved². The watchman

¹ Walter de Gruyter, *Das deutsche Tagelied*, Leipzig, 1887 (cp. the review by Gustav Roethe, *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, xvi, pp. 75-97); Friedrich Nicklas, *Untersuchung über Stil und Geschichte des deutschen Tageliedes* (*Germanische Studien*, lxxii), Berlin, 1929.

² Dietmar von Eist, *Minnesangs Frühling*, 39, 18-29; Kaiser Heinrich VI, *ibid.*, 4, 35-5, 15; Heinrich von Morungen, *ibid.*, 143, 22-144, 16.

of the *tageliet*, borrowed from the figure of the *gaita* in the Provençal *alba*, is introduced into German literature by Wolfram von Eschenbach, whose magnificent imagery, dramatic dialogue and vividly conceived situations dominate the *tageliet* throughout the Middle Ages. After Wolfram, every *tageliet* has a watchman; it is he who announces the break of dawn, and thus it falls to him to enumerate the signs of approaching day: the pale streak of light in the east, the dimming of the stars, the cool wind, the awakening birds. The parting of the lady and her lover inevitably tended to introduce elements proper to the ballad and it was the watchman who preserved the lyrical note.

In most *tageliet* knight, lady and watchman are assigned active rôles. The watchman sounds his warning, the lady awakens and bewails her lot, the knight is roused by her cries, comforts her, and departs leaving her to her tears and the empty day. Often the action is retarded by introduction of new matter: the lady begs the watchman to grant them a little longer, the watchman sounds his warning too early, and is only persuaded to take up his post again when he has been promised a larger reward. On account of the ever-growing importance of the watchman the active rôles of knight and lady are often unduly curtailed. The last step in this développement is reached when Hadloub concentrates the whole of the action in the words of the watchman. This combination of *Wächterlied* and *tageliet* has so far only been found in Hadloub¹, and the historical importance of the poem printed here lies in the fact that it is of this exceedingly rare type.

The following poem is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale on the reverse side of the last page of MS. All. 116, fol. 314b, a manuscript of *Der Renner*². The poem is written in a sixteenth-century hand which does not occur in other parts of the codex. No attention has been paid in this reprint to the line over vowel or *n* to indicate *n* or *nn*, the use of *v* for *u*, nor to such well-known abbreviations as *v̇* for *ver*. Otherwise it has been printed as it stands except when emendation seemed necessary. In all cases where the text is emended, the MS. reading is given below.

Ich wechter synge mit truwen | und verkunde des dages zijt |
 is sal myn frauwe nit ruwen | daz sy mir loenes gijt |
 mich dunckt is nahe dem morgen | sich kolent die elemente |
 ich moisz ir ere versorgen | sy gijt mir recht presente |

¹ F. H. von der Hagen, *Minnesinger*, Leipzig, 1838, II, 285b: *Ich wil ein warnen singen*.

² Cp. Gustav Ehrismann, *Der Renner*, IV (*Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins*, CCLVI, Tübingen, 1911), p. 42. Prof. R. Priebisch copied out the poem many years ago, and has very kindly drawn my attention to it.

- R. Waz sehen ich da her gelesten | der dagesterne brennet schon |
 ist yemant hie von gesten | der sal nit langer resten |
 die porde ist uff gedon | daz saltu frauwe besynnen |
 scheide werder gast van hynnen | der sterne lucht in die zynnen |
 der dag wil schire uff goyn |
 Die naicht wilt uns entscheiden | sy keret gen oregent |
 wol uff ich warnen uch beide | die wolcken sint entphengt |
 Der phae dem dage hoverit | daz saget ym syne nature |
 Die nachtigel dispüterit in susser colorature | [?]
- R. Die sterne sint vergangen | sich blichet daz firmament |
 Der habige uff der stangen | der drybet schirtz und brangen |
 daz klynget von ort zu ent | die naicht wilt sich nit sumen |
 sy wilt dem dage rumen | sich rodet daz hemelsche lumen |
 recht abe is sy entbrent |
 Ach geselle nu laisz dir gelyngen | is ist in rechter zijt |
 ich hore die klacken klyngen | der dag uns nahe lijt |
 Der hanne wilt nunne kreigen | wal uff mit sneller yle |
 die wester wynde die wegen | der dag gait her supptile |
- R. Dem wilden als dem zamen | lucht er durch alle lant |
 sich myssent des füres flamen | in manchem husze zu samen |
 des sistu her gemant | ich wil mijn horn erschellen |
 frauwe dir und dijme gesellen | abe ir is horen wellen |
 wol uff wol uff ir beide sant.

ANNO DN̄I MILLESIMO DVI¹

There is sufficient rhyme material approximately to establish the home of the poet. *schōn* : *gedōn* : *gōn* (M.H.G. *schōne* : *gedān* : *gān*) (Weinhold, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 90), *orient* : *entphengt* with the peculiarly Middle German development of *nd*, *nt* to *ng* (Weinhold, § 219), the apocope of the infinitive -*n* (*entscheiden* : *beide*) (Weinhold, § 217), 2nd pers. pl. *wellen* : *gesellen* (Weinhold, § 369) and the contraction *sant* for *samet* all point to West Middle Germany in general and to Rheinfranken in particular. Many peculiarities help us to establish the dialect of the scribe. They are partly orthographical and represent the spelling which, with minor differences, was in vogue all along the Lower and Middle

¹ 1 verkundige dez dags. 2 loen. 3 element. 5 dage sterne; schone. 7 gedan. 8 gaste. 9 dage. 11 entphenget. 12 yme. 13 folnatur. This does not make sense. *colorature* which has been put into the text with some doubt first occurs in German in 1604 according to Hans Schulz, *Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch*, I, Strassburg, 1913, p. 355. 16 klynget zu allen orten. We require a rhyme in *ent*. Cp. *uberal dis welt von ort ze endt regniert der edel element* (*Liederbuch der Clara Hätzlerin*, 24a). Other quotations of phrase (also Dutch: *van oord to ende*) in Grimm's *Wörterbuch* under *Ort*. 17 hemelsche gesterne. 19 Auch laiszze. 20 dage. 22 dage. 26 wullent. 27 samen.

Rhine; partly they represent the copyist's pronunciation. We will take the latter first.

i for M.H.G. *ē*: *is* (five times, but always *der*, *des*, etc.), *schirtz*.

e for M.H.G. *i*: *hemelsche*, and M.H.G. *ie*: *hoverit*, *dispüterit*.

a for M.H.G. *o*: *sal* (twice), *salu*, *wal* (once; on the other hand there are three *wol*), *klacken*, *abe* (twice), *van* (once; also once *von*).

o for M.H.G. *uo*: *kolent*.

d for M.H.G. *t*: *dag* (seven times), *drybet*; after *r*: *werder*, *porde* (this is Latin *porta* and the *d* is introduced by analogy without any etymological justification); between vowels: *rodet*.

ph for M.H.G. *pf* initially: *phae* (the *p* in *porde* is common M.H.G.), *entphenget*.

Inorganic *e* in the nom. sing.: *dage* (five times), *gaste*, *habige*.

Shortened form *uff* (seven times) for M.H.G. *ūf*.

Twice the 1st pers. sing. pres. ind. is formed in *-n*: *sehen*, *warnen*. On the other hand we find *synge*, *verkundige*, *hore*. Removal of the *-n* would in both cases prevent disyllabic dip (*Waz sehe ich*, *ich warne uch*). Since, however, this *-n* would be quite proper in the poet's dialect and, moreover, he frequently employs a dip of two syllables, alteration would hardly be justified.

3rd pers. sing. pres. ind. *wilt* (three times, once *wil*).

Orthographical peculiarities. Use of *e*, *i* and *y* to mark long vowels: *loen*, *goyñ*, *moisz*, *laisze*, *gait*. The so-called 'graphic *i*' also occurs with short vowels in *naicht* (twice, but not in *nachtigel*). On the use of the 'graphic *i*,' cp. Ernst Dornfeld, *Untersuchungen zu Gottfried Hagens Reimchronik der Stadt Köln* (*Germanistische Abhandlungen*, XL, Breslau, 1912, pp. 95–118).

Use of *ij* for long *i*: *ziijt* (twice), *giijt* (twice), *liijt*, *mijn*, *dijme* (also *y* and *i*, for instance: *yle*, *supptile*).

ss to indicate *sch* (*myssent*) (Weinhold, § 210).

g as a voiced spirant between vowels: *oregent*, *kreigen*, *wegen*. In *habige* the *g* stands for M.H.G. *ch* (Weinhold, §§ 223, 224).

k for Upper German *g* occurs initially in *klacken* (Weinhold, § 229).

It is clear that the scribe hails from the Rhine districts as well. On account of his *wullent* for the poet's *wellen* one would be inclined to seek him on the banks of the Moselle. But since he does not write *dat* or *it*, we shall have to place him just south of the *dat*: *daz* line.

Metre. Two *Stollen* of four short lines each form the *Aufgesang*. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, are fem., 2 and 4 masc. The *Abgesang*—indicated in the margin by R.—*Responsio*?—consists of nine short lines rhyming A, B, A, A,

B, C, C, C, B. A and C are fem., B masc., an intricate rhyming scheme which defeated the scribe four times (*zu allen orton : von ort zu ent*; *gesterne : lumen*; *wullent : wellen*; *samen : sant*. In the last instance the confusion arose on account of the A rhyme *zamen : flamen : samen*). Each short line has three lifts, twenty-six of the fifty-one lines have disyllabic dip. Words ending in unaccented -e form the first syllable of the dip in thirteen cases, the only 'heavy' dip is *der dagesterne brennet schon*. Monosyllabic anacrusis is the rule; disyllabic anacrusis occurs four times: *und verkunde*, *scheide* (read *scheid?*), *ach geselle*, *frauwe* (read *frau?*).

The last line of the poem has four lifts. No doubt this goes back to the poet who must have used a slightly different melodic line as an effective finish.

A study of the rhyming scheme and the metrical devices shows that the poet possessed considerable technical ability. A consideration of the manner in which he has used the traditional elements of the *tageliet* will show us that he also knew how to deal with the matter.

The lady is addressed as *frauwe* (three times; no *dierne*, *junkfrou*, *maid*), the knight as *her*, *gast*, *geselle* (no *knabe*, *jungelinc*). In this the poet is following the tradition of the Minnesang.

Ich wechter syngē mit truwen, cp. C. H.¹ xivā, 1: *Ich wahter will nu singen*.

und verkunde des dages zijt, cp. C. H. xxii, 2: *Verchünt du mir des tages schein*.

mich dunckt is nahe dem morgen, cp. C. H. xi, 194: *es nachent gen dem morgen*; xxv, 3: *mich bedunckt zwar, es wöll tagen*.

sich kolent die elemente, cp. C. H. viii, 10: *der luft, der kület gen dem tag*.

ich moisz ir ere versorgen, cp. C. H. iv, 2: *das man dein ere müg preisen*.

Waz sehen ich da her gelesten, cp. C. H. ii, 28: *ich sich des tages glasten*.

der dagesterne brennet schon, cp. C. H. xxv, 10: *Ich sich dört her erglesten ain stern, der prynnet hell*; A. L.² C. ii, 4: *Ic sie die morphen sterre*.

ist yemant hie van gestalten, cp. C. H. xxii, 3: *Ob yemant sei hie inne*; A. L. lxxiv, 5: *Och isser yemant inne die schaf hem balde van daen*.

die porde ist uff gedon, cp. A. L. lxxxii, 5: *Smorgens als die wachter die poorte onsloot*; A. L. clviii, 5: *die wachter ontsloot die poorte*.

der sterne lucht in die zynnen, cp. C. H. xxvii, 298: *der morgenstern statt uns nit ferrn und leucht hell an die zynnen*.

der dag wil schire uff goyn, Hadloub, F. H. von der Hagen, *op. cit.*, ii, 285b: *der tak der wil so schiere uf gan*.

¹ Carl Haltaus, *Liederbuch der Clara Hätzlerin*, Leipzig, 1840.

² Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Antwerpener Liederbuch vom Jahre 1544*, Hannover, 1855.

There would be little point in enumerating the correspondences throughout the three strophes. Every expression can be paralleled except *der phae dem dage hoverit* and the westerly wind (*küele wind* is the normal expression). But whereas many of the *tageliet* show a reckless disregard for chronology when dealing with the portents of day, our poet is almost pedantically correct.

The coolness preceding dawn reminds him of his task: he must protect the honour of his lady. He looks about him; Lucifer is burning in the East. Then follows the warning and further signs of approaching day: peacock and nightingale. Some little time has past, the stars have vanished, the sky is grey, slowly the red sun rises. The watchman is becoming a little anxious for the safety of his charges: *Ach geselle nu laisz dir gelingen*. Bells are ringing, cocks crowing: quickly away. The red sun is reflected in the windows; as a last resort he blows his horn, not without the humorous reflection: *abe ir is horen wellen*, and attempts to rouse the lovers with a double *wol uff*.

The poet shows some partiality for foreign words: *elemente*, *presente*, *hoverit*, *dispiüterit*, *colorature* (?), *firmament*, *lumen*.

The clear and straightforward diction of the poem and its exceptionally well-sustained unity would seem to forbid placing it later than the end of the fourteenth century. But it may possibly be earlier.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

A LETTER AND ADVERTISEMENT BY GOTTFRIED KINKEL.

In 1861 appeared a *Dictionary of Contemporary Biography* published by Richard Griffin and Co., of Ave Maria Lane, London, with the following sub-title: *A Handbook of the Peerage of Rank, Worth and Intellect containing Memoirs of nearly one thousand eminent Living Individuals*. The preface is dated 1860. A second edition of the work also appeared in 1861, and contains engravings, while the title is somewhat altered, viz. *The Rank and Talent of the Time—a Dictionary of Contemporary Biography containing one thousand interesting and accurate Memoirs of Eminent Living Celebrities*.

The British Museum Manuscript Department possesses a collection of letters sent to the firm of Griffin by various celebrities returning proofs of the accounts of their lives for publication in the dictionary, together with corrections. One of the letters is from Gottfried Kinkel; the envelope

bears the post-mark 'London Jan. 23, 1860' together with Kinkel's signature. The letter, written on mourning paper—Kinkel had suffered the loss of his wife Johanna in 1858 in tragic circumstances—is as follows:

6 Eastbourne Terrace,
W.

Jan. 21, 1860.

Gentlemen,

I have corrected as shortly as could be done the errors in the sketch of my life for your new publication, and shall feel obliged for your inserting the corrected text in a book that bids fair to become very interesting.

I am,

Gentlemen,

Yours respectfully,

G. Kinkel.

Messrs.

Rich. Griffin and Co.
Ave Maria Lane.

That you should mention me as a poet, seems fair; one of my poetical works has now 26¹, another 6² editions. So the addition of that one line in the beginning seems justified and will not appear immodest. [B.M. Additional, 28,510.]

The proof is pasted on a single sheet of paper, both proof and paper being liberally marked by corrections, some of which are apparently by a member of the firm of Griffin, the others by Kinkel himself. Kinkel's corrections are not confined to the proof; they also affect the written emendations. Let us first give the proof as it appears after the non-Kinkel alterations have been made, but before Kinkel himself has modified it.

KINKEL, GOTTFRIED³, formerly professor of history, the fine arts, and modern literature in the university of Bonn is son of a protestant minister; born in 1815, at Obercassel, a village of Rhenish Prussia. His father took charge of his education until he entered the Gymnasium of Bonn, where he distinguished himself in Science and the various branches of learning taught in that institution, obtaining the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and for some years teaching divinity. In 1837 he travelled through Italy (in order) to qualify himself for lecturing on Christian art; it was on his return that he became a teacher. He advocated with more boldness than was agreeable to the Prussian Government, a separation of Church and State; the minister of the day expressed his hostility to Kinkel openly; the young professor was stung into a more bitter expression of his political opinions; he surrendered theology and devoted himself to historical literature and ancient and mediaeval art. He lived quietly until the revolution of 1848 withdrew Kinkel from retirement of study into the bustle of public life; as a democrat, he gave great offence to the court party in Prussia, and was more than once imprisoned for the freedom of his opinions. So vindictively was he treated while bearing with the ills of incarceration and hard labour, that of meat he was only allowed a few ounces four times a year. In 1850 he made his escape from the fortress of Spandau, and landed at Edinburgh, ultimately fixing his residence in London. Dr Kinkel has supported himself as a lecturer on sculpture and painting.

Kinkel's own alterations on the proof-sheet and its accompanying notes are considerable, and amount almost to a complete re-writing and ampli-

¹ Or 28—the writing is not clear.

² Written thus.

³ Strangely enough, the spelling is not corrected to Gottfried until it appears in the actual biography.

fication of the original. A little imagination is perhaps required to reconcile his insertion of the phrase 'and well known in his country as a Poet' with his denial of immodesty in the postscript to his letter. While his liberal use of capital letters and commas is distinctly German, it is interesting to note his perfectly justified correction of the clumsy expression 'that of meat he was only allowed a few ounces four times a year.' The full text of Kinkel's version is as follows:

KINKEL, GOTTFRIED, formerly professor of the history of art and literature in the university of Bonn and well known in his country as a Poet, is son of a protestant minister; born in 1815, at Oberassel, a village of Rhenish Prussia. His father took charge of his education until he entered the Gymnasium and subsequently the University of Bonn, where he distinguished himself in the various branches of classical learning and divinity. In 1837 he travelled through Italy to study Christian art; it was on his return that he became a lecturer on Divinity, specially in Ecclesiastical History, for nine years. He advocated with more boldness than was agreeable to the Prussian government, a separation of Church and State; the minister of the day, Mr Eichhorn, expressed his hostility to Kinkel openly; the young professor was stung into a more bitter expression of his political opinions; he surrendered theology and devoted himself to the History of Literature, Modern Civilization and Fine Art, for which he was at last, in 1846, regularly appointed as Professor in the University [of Bonn¹], having, at the same time, received the degree of Doctor in Philosophy on the part of the Philosophical Faculty of Bonn. He lived quietly until the revolution of 1848 withdrew him from retirement into the bustle of public life. As a democrat, he gave great offence to the court party in Prussia, specially in 1849 by his opposition to the Manteuffel Ministry as a member of the Lower House of Legislature in Prussia [in 1849¹]. In June 1849 he [took¹] entered a volunteer corps for the defence of the Frankfort Constitution, was wounded in the field, [and¹] taken prisoner by the Prussian troops in the Great Duchy of Baden, and condemned by Court Martial to imprisonment for life in a fortress. [which¹] Instead of a military prison, however, he was confined to a house of correction and so vindictively treated while bearing with the ills of incarceration and hard labour, that he was only allowed a few ounces of meat four times a year. In 1850 he made his escape from the fortress of Spandau, and landed at Edinburgh, ultimately fixing his residence in London, where he now lives as a Professor of German Language and literature (*sic*), and as a Lecturer on the History of Fine Art.

The actual text appearing in the published work does not differ essentially from the above version by Kinkel, though it summarises it to a certain extent. The Christian name is duly corrected to Gottfried, but one can imagine that Kinkel would not be pleased with the alteration of his phrase 'well known in his country as a Poet' to 'a German poet and critic.' The reference to Kinkel as a Professor of German Language and 'litterature' recalls the fact that the following advertisement appeared in the *Athenaeum* for September 23, 1854 (p. 1125):

German classes at Islington.—Dr Gottfried Kinkel is about to open two German Classes, for Ladies, one for beginners, the other for advanced Pupils.—For particulars, apply at the College, No. 4, Milner-square, Islington.

GERALD W. SPINK.

JARROW-ON-TYNE.

¹ Crossed out by Kinkel.

REVIEWS

Poetry and the Criticism of Life. By H. W. GARROD. Oxford: University Press. 1931. 168 pp. 7s. 6d.

'Throughout this book "Cambridge" means Cambridge, Massachusetts, and "Oxford" means Oxford, England.' Thus Professor Garrod opens his new book, and a resident of Cambridge, England, may perhaps be pardoned the suggestion that had Dr Garrod been more aware of the English University, he would have been more guarded in some of his statements. He tells us, for instance, of his regret 'that Matthew Arnold's critical writings have so much gone out of fashion' (p. 26) and that 'To-day, I do not observe that young men read him' (p. 67). So far from that being so Arnold is constantly read and as constantly discussed by Cambridge (England) undergraduates, and many of them (and their teachers) venture to think of him as in the forefront of English critics.

It is this determination to say something unusual, and in his own way, that limits the value of Dr Garrod's book. For example, we are told in three different lectures that Hazlitt is the greatest of English critics for the speaker, and wait eagerly for the reasons upon which this unusual judgment is based. At last we get it. On p. 150 we read, 'The more I discover how easy it is to be dull, the more does a judgment too personal to be wrong incline me to regard Hazlitt as the greatest of English critics (p. 150).' On the other hand, when Dr Garrod gives some reasons for his beliefs we are but little less concerned. What are we to reply to a professor who thinks that 'Matthew Arnold's real distinction, and the best hope for him of a permanent fame in criticism, is that he is so extraordinarily enjoyable,' and that he possesses 'a bland finish of manner,' and a 'delicacy of irony beyond praise' (p. 83)? Many must have wished that Arnold's finish had been a trifle more bland, and his irony rather more delicate on several occasions. Can it be that 'the snobbery and dandyism' that Dr Garrod detects in Arnold is dearer to him than it is to many of us? 'There is a good deal of the poseur in Arnold,' he writes, 'I not only concede it cheerfully, but, to be honest, I enjoy it. I like the good art of it, and the supercilious airy amiability with which it is managed' (p. 83).

I dwell on the Arnold essays, because they are by far the best things in the book, but elsewhere there is little satisfaction for those who, beguiled by its title, hope to find substantial matter in it. The first essay, with its portentous title 'Poetry and Life,' is forcing an open door for the most part, while the concluding essay, 'Methods of Criticism,' with its talk of the present vogue of subjective criticism, seems years and years behind the time. Who are these modern subjective critics we wonder who are 'almost everywhere in power; and much as I like them, their vogue alarms me...' (p. 161). Will it be believed that Professor Garrod only quotes from one of them, and does not so much as mention the name of another? And the fellow who is causing all this pothor in 1931 is Monsieur Anatole

France, who wrote some newspaper articles, afterwards published under the title of *La Vie Littéraire*, in 1888!

As one reads on, the plain fact emerges that these lectures were written because the chair of poetry at Harvard demanded them: the links between them are so thin that they will not bear investigation. Further, whatever charm they possessed, invested with the graces of a personal delivery, they now sadly lack, while the odds and ends of jokes and allusions intended for an American audience have long since lost their freshness and appeal. And worse: the careless references that a lecturer may permit himself are here enshrined in print and given the imprimatur of a great university. Dr Garrod has a reputation as an exact scholar, and uses his learning to make fun of Arnold, but he is inexcusably casual only too often in this volume. 'Somewhere¹,' he writes, *I think in the essay on Wordsworth*, Arnold speaks in a tone rather slighting of Wordsworth's great Ode. . . . Not only does he find in it—if *I remember rightly*—some element of the declamatory, but. . . I have never very well understood that' (p. 31). It is difficult to be interested in Professor Garrod's understandings and misunderstandings while we are left in doubt as to what essay he is quoting from and what his author has actually written.

H. S. BENNETT.

CAMBRIDGE.

Alliterative Poetry in Middle English. By J. P. OAKDEN. Manchester: University Press. 1930. xii + 273 pp. 12s. 6d.

In this excellent and scholarly work we have before us a very complete survey of an interesting and important body of Middle English poetry. The very detailed and industrious examination of some seventy alliterative poems of varying length, in dialect as well as metrical form, has led Dr Oakden to certain interesting conclusions; in particular, the metrical evidence clearly indicates a common authorship for certain groups of poems, such as *Sir Gawain* and *Purity and Patience*. And a further conclusion, which has been in the minds of scholars for some time and which is definitely corroborated by Dr Oakden's researches, is that the reappearance of the alliterative long-line in the fourteenth century is not so much a revival as a genuine continuation and development of the Old English tradition, though as in the case of prose some of the intermediary stages have been lost. In this respect Dr Oakden has given due attention to all extant specimens from before 1400, including such little known fragments as *A Description of Durham*. We may be sure that his promised continuation volume in which he proposes to study the vocabulary, phraseology and style of this field of mediæval writing will produce equally valuable results.

¹ Italics mine. For other references, equally vague, see pp. 30 and 69. On p. 162 Anatole France's *La Vie Littéraire* is called *Vie Littéraire*, and in a note at the foot of the same page the extract is said to be from the chapter on Jules Lemaître. There is no such chapter in any of the four volumes of *La Vie Littéraire*, and the quotation is from a prefatory letter to M. Adrien Hébrard, I, p. iv.

The study opens with a useful summary and restatement of our knowledge of Middle English dialectal criteria and a classified list of Middle English texts which can be safely used as examples of the various dialects—a good supplement to that given in Jordan's *Handbuch der mittelenenglischen Grammatik*. Here, too, Dr Oakden has made a judicious use of place-name material. On the whole I agree with his remarks, though one or two inconsistencies and omissions might be mentioned:

P. 55 O.E. *ā* before a nasal. The *Owl and Nightingale* is here ascribed to North Wiltshire, though on p. 12 to Dorset or Surrey.

P. 17 M.E. *-ong* raised to *-ung*. Dr Oakden recognises the difficulty of dealing with this point, as in M.E. it was not often recognised in writing, but it probably had a much wider provenance than his material suggests. In the Townley play of *Noah* (ll. 397 ff.), for instance, there is the rime *yong-tong-long-emong*. Wakefield was, of course, near that part of West Yorkshire where we have decided traces of West Midland influence both in place-names and modern dialects¹. More curious is the name of a small place near Ripon (definitely in the northern area) now called Lumley; in the twelfth century this was *Langeleia* (Fountains Cartulary) and in 1271 (Yorks Inq.); it appears as *Longelay* in 1198 (Memorials of Fountains), 1272, 1278 (Yorks Inq.), 1300 etc. (Fountains Cart.), and lastly as *Lungelay* in 1355 (*ibid.*), 1379 (Poll Tax Returns), etc.²

P. 18 O.E. *y*. The spelling *suster* 'sister' (rightly explained as from O.E. *sweoster* > *swuster* > *suster*) does not properly belong here; an earlier example than that given is *suster* in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, s.a. 1140.

P. 21 O.E. *ā*. The Yorkshire boundary between the M.E. *ā/ǣ* developments was the Wharfe rather than the Aire, as modern dialects show. Scholes near Barwick in Elmet, for example, occurs as early as 1259 as *Scholes* in an Assize Roll and regularly from the beginning of the fourteenth century as *Scoles*. The district of Elmet was entirely north of the Aire, and there is some little evidence to show that it extended to the Wharfe, so that if after Penda's destruction of the British kingdom of Elmet and Leeds there was an incursion and settlement of Mercians the Wharfe would be much more likely to provide the boundary between Mercia and Northumbria in these parts of Yorkshire at all events. The same remarks apply to the boundary separating the various developments of O.E., O.N. *ō* (p. 23). Further, if the shortening of O.E. *ēa* to *ǣ* in M.E. is to be regarded as a western feature (p. 26), Aberford (*Ēadburh's ford*), also in Elmet, points to the same conclusion.

Pp. 28–29 O.E. *hw*, *cw*. In West Yorkshire, there is, excluding place-

¹ Vide Ekwall, *Contributions to the Study of Old English Dialects*. Tolkien in Haigh's *Dialect of Huddersfield* calls attention to the survival in this district of typically West Midland words like *ælsh* 'loop, knot,' *bob* 'cluster, bunch,' *gruch* 'grudge, grumble,' *nobbut* 'only, except,' *oss* 'move, stir, offer,' *toppin* 'forelock,' and such forms as *bern* 'burn,' *foorst* 'first,' *dō* 'thrive,' *kuss* 'kiss,' etc., as well as double forms like *ei* and *ī* 'high,' *læng* and *lōng* 'long,' and the survival in dialect *fech-foch*, *fet-fot* of the curious by-forms in *Gawayn*. Many of these forms and words occur in the Halifax area further up the Calder Vale.

² Miss Serjeantson has also called attention to other examples not noted by Dr Oakden (*Review of English Studies*, Oct. 1931).

names in Craven (especially those recorded in the Cockersand Cartulary), more evidence for over-aspiration than Dr Oakden supposes. There are not many instances, simply because the place-names where the form could occur are not many, but we may note Wheatley near Halifax and Wheels Brook in Upperthong (Huddersfield) recorded respectively as *Queteley* and *Queles-*, *Welesbothem* (O.E. *hwēol*) in the Wakefield Court Rolls (1308), Whitehaughs in Fixby near Halifax, *le Qwithalgh* 1336 (Yorks Deeds), and Whitley near Huddersfield as *Qwittlay* in 1414, to mention only a few. In early deeds and wills we find forms like *Qwesonday* 1454 (Yorks Deeds, I, 71, from Aberford near Leeds), *Qwyrt Sonday*, *qwylk* 1438 (*ibid.*, 4, from Garforth near Leeds). Even more significant are the later inverted forms of Quarmby near Huddersfield, earlier *Quernebi*, but *Wharneby*, *Whernby* in the fifteenth century, and *whischyns* by the side of *qwyschins* 'cushions' in the will of Matilda Marshall of York 1392 (Test. Ebor., I, 181-2), besides the modern dialect form *wick* (O.E. *cwic*) 'alive.' Such instances show that the original area of over-aspiration extended much further south in Yorkshire than is generally supposed.

P. 35 pres. indic. plur. endings. As Dr Oakden shows, there was considerable overlapping between districts where *-es* and *-en* forms were in use. It might have been worth while investigating further such texts as the works of Rolle or Manning to see whether there might not be some distinction in use similar to that found in some modern North Midland dialects (Halifax, Huddersfield), where *-s* is used after substantive subjects and *-n* after pronominal subjects (as *they gon* but *t'childer gos*).

In this section of the work Dr Oakden provides a map with the approximate limits of the various dialectal tests sketched in. The inclusion of county names would have made it more readily usable. The remainder of Part I is taken up with a survey of M.E. alliterative poems from the point of view of dialect.

In Part II Dr Oakden discusses the last remnants of O.E. alliterative verse and shows that the Middle English developments of these older types of verse were in part at any rate due to the existence of a popular and freer kind of verse in Old English, especially the alliterative rhythmic prose found in the Old English homilies and later annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. He agrees with Rankin in supposing that use of rime in later Old English was not due to the influence of the Latin hymns of the Church but to popular tradition, and from this we have the gradual emergence of a native couplet in Middle English (as in the *Proverbs of Alfred*). This section is accompanied by carefully devised statistics on the metrical and alliterative formulae in common use in Middle English. The whole thesis is that the versification of the great alliterative poems of the west and of the north is not a copy of that in vogue in Old English times, but a development of it with historical continuity even in the minor metrical features. One has always felt that the author of *Sir Gawain* or Rolle or the author of the *Owl and Nightingale* could hardly have been innovators in their own forms of literature and yet achieve such stylistic success in what apparently were new literary types; rather, their work represents the culmination of a long tradition. As Dr Oakden now proves

in his own field, there must have been a considerable body of vernacular literature from the twelfth century which is no longer extant. At that time the Church was largely instrumental in putting on permanent record and preserving what specimens of contemporary literature have survived, but Englishmen were not encouraged to enter the Church—the Constitutions of Clarendon expressly forbade the sons of villeins to enter the priesthood, and even where Englishmen did enter the monastic orders they probably dropped the vernacular in favour of Latin or French, for these languages were by regulation the colloquial speech in monastic houses (Vising, *Anglo-Norman*, p. 11).

Finally, there are appendices dealing with the common authorship of various poems and on the locality of the Green Knight's castle and chapel, here suggested with some probability to have been at Clitheroe in Lancashire.

A. H. SMITH.

LONDON.

The English Works of Sir Thomas More. Vol. I. Edited by W. E. CAMPBELL, with A. W. REED and R. W. CHAMBERS. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1931. xv + 511 pp. 42s.

Those who, like the present reviewer, have in times past given a bond of thirty pounds for permission to borrow More's *English Works* from the London Library, and have had reason to be thankful to that wonderful institution for the loan upon those reasonable terms, ought to be among the first to welcome this reprint, even at the price which its elaborate scale necessitates. We have here an anastatic facsimile of nearly 300 pages from the small sixteenth-century folio, followed by a transliteration in modern type and spelling, with elaborate introductions and notes, and with many pages of collations from the different texts by Mr W. A. G. Doyle-Davidson, to whom the two Professors have given a warm testimonial in a recent letter to *The Times Literary Supplement*.

It is doubtless the General Editor, Mr Campbell, who is to be thanked for the excellent idea of basing the whole on anastatic reprints. Although this adds very considerably to the expense of the volumes, it puts the whole work on a scientific basis; and some day there will perhaps be a cheaper reissue of the text alone in a couple of volumes.

From the purely linguistic point of view, this edition is generally admirable. More is seldom difficult to read in any case; and Professor Reed's notes seem to leave no stone unturned. The one linguistic flaw is in Mr Campbell's Latin. In the second volume which appeared in 1927 there are at least a dozen serious misprints—pp. 14, 20, 38, 63, 73, 221, 264, 284, 290—nearly all of these show strange unfamiliarity with the Vulgate Bible; two lines on p. 20 yield *non habes deos alienos* and *nolite converti ad idoles neque deos conflatiles facietis*. On p. 264, where More writes quite correctly (in the spelling of his day) *ad Serenum episcopum massilie*, Mr Campbell has taken upon himself to emend, in defiance of all grammar, *massilie[nsis]*. The diphthong *ae*, again, is generally given correctly as *æ*; but, towards the end of Vol. II, it is often reproduced in

More's own form of single *e*. Finally, it is not fair to More to print his Latin poetry in the form in which Rastell left it, without suggestions of emendation (Vol. I, pp. ciii and 335). It is scarcely credible that, even in his youth, he could have perpetrated such a hiatus as *celeri pede omnia cedunt* (where *somnia* would make sense) or such a blunder in syntax as *qui manet?* for *quid manet?* Here, again, Mr Campbell prints without warning, in the 4th line, *pascit* for Rastell's *poscit*. These, however, are exceptions to the general care of the text.

But, in the case of this great Chancellor and martyr, the introductions and essays are even more important than the textual apparatus. Of all that is printed in the volume now under consideration, the most valuable, from the purely literary point of view, is the *History of Richard the Third*; and here the one capital gain is that Professor Chambers reassures us, who had read the book in our cheap reprints, by a train of arguments which seem quite conclusive in favour of More's authorship. And, for those who do not discover it for themselves now that the whole text of the *Dialogue* is accessible in Vol. II of this edition, his paper read before the British Academy and his essay in the More memorial volume will reveal the riches of More's dramatic vein, and the extent to which More may be regarded as a precursor of Shakespeare.

But all these matters of style, important as they are, are secondary to More's fundamental thoughts; to his position as Utopian, as Chancellor and as Martyr. In dealing with these points, we are confronted with some of the most vital questions in social and ecclesiastical history; questions which are still hotly debated after four centuries, because they are so fundamental and so complicated. And here we seem in danger of retrogression; that swing of the pendulum which has cleared away more than one unjust aspersion upon More's character seems likely to do injustice, for a time at least, not only to his opponents in controversy but to the hero himself as a world-figure, apart from the figure of a man who died heroically in defence of a particular party.

In its crudest form, this new tendency has perhaps shown itself most plainly on a front-page article of the *Times Literary Supplement* (July 9, 1931) where we are told that 'in all consideration of his life and writings it is necessary to make sure about the *Utopia* first—it might almost be said, to get the *Utopia* out of the way first... The *Utopia*, in fact, was meant to end and to remain a learned joke.' This is, after all, only a somewhat exaggerated presentment of the position for which Mr W. E. Campbell argues at length in his monograph on More's *Utopia*; and something of the kind is even suggested by Professor Reed in the second volume. But ought not those who would 'get the *Utopia* out of the way,' even in a limited sense, to begin by quoting some sort of evidence for its neglect as a mere *jeu d'esprit* by any thoughtful man of More's own time? And, secondly, do we really exalt More from the wider viewpoint, *sub specie aeternitatis*, by striving so hard to save his youthful orthodoxy? The More whom many of us have always seemed to see is a man whose generous youthful aspirations were not quenched in later life, but who, in high office, found it more difficult to do the best thing than to think

out, in his own study, what would be ideally best. To take a modern instance: there would have been no real treason to Socialism if William Morris had been confronted with an attempt to bring the Soviet State straight into England, and had deliberately sacrificed his life in resistance to what, for that time, he had regarded as far more harmful than beneficial. To apply this to More is not to diminish his stature appreciably. But, on the other hand, to suppose that, in 1516, he wrote in sport a booklet which supplied powerful solvents of the medieval creed—wrote it in sport, and yet published it for all the hundreds who could read Latin and could put two and two together—while all this time he was as seriously convinced of the whole medieval doctrine, in its main points at least, as he showed himself ready and willing to die for some of those points in 1535—this would seem to be a very real blot upon his character. Is it not far more natural to suppose that there were to some extent two men in him, as in all of us, and that, while he longed for such legal tolerance as the modern world has achieved since his death, he thoroughly disbelieved in Tyndale's methods, and was willing to slay or be slain in that controversy?

Yet, it must be repeated, to have these texts themselves is a very great gain; in due time, they will doubtless be fully discussed from all historical points of view, and will find their own level.

G. G. COULTON.

CAMBRIDGE.

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE. *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris*.

Edited by H. S. BENNETT. London: Methuen. 1931. ix + 269 pp. 10s. 6d.

One cannot but feel some sympathy for a scholar who is called upon to edit, in the traditional manner appropriate to an English classic, two such texts as *The Jew* and *The Massacre*. The patient explanation of verbal difficulties and accumulation of parallel passages become rather hollow, when they are applied to lines which, in their present form at least, Marlowe cannot possibly have written. Mr Bennett bravely essays his task, and does all that is possible in the circumstances, with the help of a wide range of contemporary reading. And he is fully conscious throughout of the ambiguous nature of his material, and of the scanty means available for the elucidation of the problems which it raises. Marlowe has, indeed, suffered more than any other Elizabethan dramatist from the popularity which kept his plays alive, or rather, slowly decaying, upon the stage. The two texts before us, although both have suffered disaster, have not had a common history. In the case of *The Massacre*, Mr Bennett accepts, and I think with justice, the view of Dr Greg that what we have is a 'stolne and surreptitious' version, due to the activity of a reporter, although he thinks that the phrase—'Yet Caesar shall go forth,' which it shares with *Julius Caesar*, may be one traditional on the stage, and adopted both by Marlowe and by Shakespeare. The condition of *The Jew*, on the other hand, lends itself to alternatives of interpretation. It is excellent Marlowe up to near the end of the second act; then shows signs

of breaking down, and soon passes into huddled scenes of mingled prose and verse, in which, or in some of which, bits of Marlowe stand out from a background of crude tragedy and equally crude farce. During most of the fifth act, Marlowe, not at his best, is recovered. The unevenness of this does not suggest the intervention of a reporter, and perhaps the most plausible explanation is that *The Jew* is one of the comparatively rare cases, in which a play has only come down to us in a form rehandled to suit an audience of inferior mentality to that aimed at by the original author. Such a view has often been taken, and at one point of his introduction (p. 9) seems to be taken by Mr Bennett, although he is not so certain as some other writers that the culprit was Thomas Heywood, who prefixed an epistle to the earliest known edition of 1633, and probably wrote prologues and epilogues for a revival of a slightly earlier date. But at another point (p. 15) he seems to think that something is to be said for a rival theory, which ascribes the condition of the central acts to a breakdown of Marlowe, who either lost interest in the play or was pressed by the theatre to make it available for performances before he was really ready. This seems to me very far-fetched. We do not, indeed, know from better accredited work how Marlowe handled prose, if he ever handled it at all. We do know, or reasonably suspect, that he led a ramshackle life. But neither what he left behind him nor the references of his contemporaries justify us in supposing that it ever brought him to a state of intellectual degradation, in which he would have been capable of writing these scenes. Nor do I quite understand why Mr Bennett thinks (pp. 6, 9) that the condition of the text may have been in part brought about by 'gradual processes of degradation and minor alteration' due to the tricks of repertory actors who, when their memory fails, 'gag from half-remembered passages and phrases.' They do, no doubt, but how does Mr Bennett think that, apart from the intervention of a reporter, which he does not suggest for *The Jew*, such things get into print? If we accept an adapter, it is of course possible that, while making havoc of Marlowe's language, he followed an outline of Marlowe's plot. The destruction of Lodowick was natural revenge for the raid on Barabas's wealth. It did not logically involve that of Mathias. But given this, there is a fairly intelligible sequence of melodramatic linking through Abigail's repudiation of Barabas, the poisoning of her, her revelation to the friars, their outcry against Barabas, the murder of Bernardine and false accusation of Jacomo, the blackmailing of Barabas by Ithamore and his friends, the ineffective attempt to suppress them by poisoned flowers, and the recourse to a sham death, which leads up to Marlowe's final scenes. As to what Marlowe's own treatment of all this matter might have been, we can only be sure that its literary quality would be very different from that of the extant text. Surely Mr Bennett is rather carried away by the desire to expound a classic, when he says that 'the play is everywhere alive, even at those moments at which it most conflicts with our modern prepossessions,' and that 'if we try to see in it what its earliest audiences saw . . . we shall get from it something of what its creator intended—a vigorous, vital drama written in the vigorous and

vital language of which he was so great a master.' We do not, for three-fifths of the play, know what its earliest audiences saw. All speculations as to what it stood for in Marlowe's literary development must remain hazardous.

Detailed criticism of Mr Bennett's careful and well-informed editing can hardly find place in a short review. The 'Huntingdon' library and 'W. A. Wight's' library, to which he ascribes copies of the plays (p. 257) should be 'Huntington' and 'W. A. White's.' There was no 'Lord Cecil' in 1569 (p. 25).

E. K. CHAMBERS.

EYNSHAM, OXFORDSHIRE.

The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling. Edited by L. E. KASTNER and H. B. CHARLTON. 2 vols. Manchester: University Press. 1921, 1929. ccxxx + 482 pp. and liii + 644 pp. Each 28s.

It is a pity that there is no Lucian among us to give us a report of the triumph of Sir William Alexander among the shades of the minor poets when his poetical works were issued by Professors Kastner and Charlton. Their volumes are a test of the value of modern editions of deservedly forgotten writers for circulation even exclusively among scholars. A year after the appearance of the first volume Mr F. L. Lucas remarked in the same breath in which he recognised it as 'standard' that editions of Alexander are 'happily scarce,' and Mr T. S. Eliot has more recently damned *The Monarchicke Tragedies* as 'more important in the history of the Union (between Scotland and England) than in the history of drama.' It is, as the editors confess, 'hard to save a poet who is so persistent in destroying himself.' Only a world which can afford to be recklessly prodigal of expert scholarship would try to save him. Nemesis presides at the birth of the editorial plea that although the compositions in the second volume have little intrinsic worth, 'there emerge from them at least two topics which are of some importance to scholarship.' As a means of determining the 'Belesenheit' of a typical cultured Scot in the reign of James VI the editors admit that Alexander's allusions are too diffuse to be serviceable. The records which we have of the library of Drummond of Hawthornden are worth more for that object than Alexander's whole works. And the linguistic value of *Domes-day* and of *Aurora* to students of the standards of propriety in the first quarter of the seventeenth century can be most conveniently furnished in such an analysis as the editors supply in their introduction (pp. ix-xvi).

The only disappointment of the reviewer in the volume which has recently appeared is the reversal of the earlier decision of the editors to supply that 'substantial introduction to *Domes-day*, tracing the course of the English religious epic in relation to the type practised on the Continent' by Du Bartas, which their splendid survey of the Senecan tradition in their former volume had led him to expect. Few, if any, other scholars are or ever can be as well fitted to write such a monograph as are Messrs Kastner and Charlton, and it is to be hoped that they will make their knowledge available in a separate book.

Praise of the textual work in this volume could hardly be too high. By every test of internal evidence it appears to be practically flawless. The notes also are excellent. Every significant allusion is tracked down, and the work is always done with shrewd attention to the channels of indirect access to Alexander's ultimate sources and with insight into the motives and hazards of his multifarious reading. Such editing is peculiarly apt for a poet whose notion of composition was as naïvely allusive as his was. His editors need patience and humour as well as erudition to meet the recurring challenge of almost every stanza. The zest of the game which the poet plays against his commentators fully excuses the few cases in which the latter seem rather too certain of the provenance of a given passage, as they do, for example, when they trace the family tree of the catalogue of infernal monsters in the Tenth Houre of *Domes-day* (l. 425) 'in the direct order Virgil, Vida, Tasso, Alexander, Milton.'

The challenge which Alexander throws to his readers was flattering in the seventeenth century, but in the twentieth it is irritating. To accept it is to become almost inevitably a pedant. The present editors have avoided that danger and have produced an extraordinarily significant and coherent corpus of notes. Only in the latter part of their commentary do they grow a little weary in well-doing. There the volume of annotation in proportion to that on *Domes-day* shrinks, and only the hardest nuts are cracked. The fault, if it is a fault, is venial. Students will be grateful to have the proverb of Scylla and Charybdis in *Aurora* (p. 453, l. 18) traced to the *Alexandreis* of Philippe Gualtier of Châtillon, but by the same token they have a right to expect some enlightenment on the reflection in the three lines immediately following of the maxim which Spenser used (and on which E.K. learnedly dissertated) in the February Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calendar*:

The soveraigne of seas he blames in vaine,
That, once seabate, will to sea againe. (ll. 33-4)

The editors avoid all discussion of Alexander's connexion with the development of poetry in the later seventeenth century. They include in their introduction a few admirable pages upon the importance of his gradually de-Scotticised language in the growth of his own literary taste and in that of his contemporaries. It would be interesting to trace the influence of his manner upon the later religious epic. Miltonic foregleams are rare, but some remark upon them would be edifying, for the reader is likely to pause over such characteristic lines as this from *Jonathan*:

Vrg'd, shunn'd, forc'd, fayn'd, bow'd, rais'd, hand, leg, left, right— (l. 556)

to speculate upon their connexion with the famous passage near the close of the Second Book of *Paradise Lost* where

... the Fiend,
O'er bog or steep, through strait, rough, dense, or rare,
With head, hands, wings, or feet, pursues his way. (ll. 947-9)

The editors leave it to Professor Witherspoon to trace¹ Alexander's fondness for this trick of style to Garnier.

¹ Alexander Maclaren Witherspoon, *The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama* (*Yale Studies in English*, lxxv), 1924, p. 175.

In the ten years which have passed since the appearance of the first volume of Alexander's works, consisting of *The Monarchicke Tragedies*, the value of the fine introduction in which the editors surveyed the Senecan tradition in Italy, France and England has been thoroughly proven. In several respects their work was revolutionary and its thoroughness and independence bore mutual attestation. The best part of it was that which dealt with the Senecan tradition in Italy. It disposed of the claim of Trissino and Rucellai to a significant Hellenism and anatomised Cinthio's un-choric choruses and un-Greek happy endings for what they are. It brought the dramatic theory of Cinthio and of his contemporaries into illuminating focus upon his drama and displayed the 'two separate currents of feeling (in Cinthio's creative work) resulting from the resolution of the one indissoluble state of being, which Aristotle in the moments of his deepest insight described as the feeling of pity-and-fear' (p. lxxxviii). From the 'inevitable consequence of the dual interest in horror and pathos, villain and heroine,' viz., the 'preference, contrary to Aristotle's, for what at Aristotle's suggestion is called "the double plot"' (p. xcii), it traced the relaxation of the unities and the development of tragi-comedy in Italy, and ultimately in England. Later scholarship has borne out Professors Kastner and Charlton's contention for the pivotal importance of Cinthio in Italy and for his indirect influence through minor Italian plays upon the development even of pastoral tragi-comedy in England.

In his study of the influence of Robert Garnier upon Elizabethan drama Professor Witherspoon has fully sustained Professor Kastner's assertion of the almost exclusive control of Garnier's conception of tragedy over Alexander. The case for that control is made more completely by Mr Witherspoon (pp. 137-43), but no more convincingly than it is by Professor Kastner.

In their study of the English Seneca the editors went boldly counter to received opinion with their demonstration that the supposedly classical *Gismond*, *Gorboduc*, and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* are essentially Cinthian in spirit. Their comparison of the society for which Cinthio's tragedies were written with that which sponsored the *Gesta Grayorum* is particularly cogent. The consequence is that the plays of the Countess of Pembroke's coterie (in which Alexander now seems to have enjoyed at least a non-resident membership) are separated more widely than scholarly opinion has ever separated them from all other manifestations of the English Seneca. The present editors lay stress upon the complete abstraction of the French Seneca from life—differing in this from Professor Witherspoon, who insists upon the political idealism of Garnier as a factor in his dramaturgy—but they agree that the high seriousness of *The Monarchicke Tragedies*, which commands genuine respect, was born of an idealism which Alexander shared with Garnier.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes. By LILY B. CAMPBELL. Cambridge: University Press. 1930. 248 pp. 16s.

The most disputed proposition in Aristotle's *Poetics* is the remark that in tragedy plot is primary, character coming in only in its train. The misgivings excited by this remark indicate the outstanding difference between modern and ancient literature. From the Renaissance onwards, we have concerned ourselves more and more with those elements in life which are specifically and comprehensively the stuff of character. Elizabethan, and supremely Shakespearean, drama is Europe's first compendious corpus of these new interests in personality. It is particularly rich in its exhibition of the mysterious and irrational promptings which are at least half a man's destiny as they are at least half his nature. Tragedy, above all, displays the operations of the passions in directing man to his doom. Hence our great books on Shakespeare's tragedies occupy themselves with analyses of the character of his tragic heroes and are particularly alert in the tracking of their unconscious motives.

Miss Campbell faces this recognised circumstance from a new angle. She sets out to discover what doctrine concerning the passions, what psychology, in fact, had already been formulated by the sixteenth century, and hopes thereby to throw new light on Shakespeare's tragic art. The project is theoretically sound, and the execution of it brings together a deal of curious lore interesting for itself and for the general purposes of human history. But it is to be doubted whether it throws even the thinnest beam of light on Shakespeare and his tragedies. The situation would appear to be that, although by their intuition artists had laid hold of the subtleties of personality, its mysteries had as yet eluded the comprehension of conscious and systematic thinkers, who were generally occupied in redrafting the dogmas of the past so that they might seem to fit as much of the phenomena of the present as had reached the level of scientific observation. And not infrequently, instead of guiding Miss Campbell to a deeper sense of Shakespeare's tragedies, these scientists and pseudo-scientists seem to lure her into strange and profitless attitudes.

The first section of her book, which she calls 'the purpose and method of tragedy,' collects Renaissance opinion on those topics. It is, of course, a pretty familiar field, and Miss Campbell's is a fair summary of the subject, though her attempt (p. 41) to arrange the development of that opinion as an evolution in three stages fits the mind better than the facts. But she quotes (p. 37) the passage from Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* which, better than any other contemporary statement, describes the essential substance of Elizabethan drama 'where we may find painted forth with great life how affections are kindled and incited; and how pacified and refrained; and how again contained from act and further degree; how they disclose themselves, how they work, how they vary, how they gather and fortify, how they are inwrapped one within another, and how they do fight and encounter one with another, and other the like particularities.'

Her second, and most valuable, section she calls 'moral philosophy in

Shakespeare's day.' This is enriched with her discoveries amongst the more or less obscure moralists, physiologists, and 'psychologists' of the time. But her exposition of their doctrines, most of which turn on the mediæval notion of humours, could have been clearer. Technical words like 'complexion,' 'temperament,' and 'humour,' are not always carefully used; and the difficulties inherent in the subject are sometimes increased by looseness of phrasing: e.g. (p. 64) 'apprehending comes through common or "innerwyte" *in relation to* (our italics) imagination, judgment, and memory, and through particular or outer "wytte": and (p. 65) 'Wylkinson's translation of Aristotle was rather confusing on this point in its comment on the powers of the soul as rational and irrational, with the conspicuous (or appetitive) as being called reasonable when it obeyed reason.' There is, however, a great deal of antiquarian salvage in these pages.

But it is the biggest and culminating section of her work which seems to us so disappointing and so misleading. What has been gained by all this intriguing research? In its process, fears have come that even if Miss Campbell's generalisations on tragedy might fit the theoretic norm, they would not fit a play like *Hamlet*, and might possibly induce the author to fit *Hamlet* to the theories. And towards the end of her exposition of the moralists' views on the effects of wine, she writes a sentence which multiplies every fear: 'it is important,' she says, 'to note this belief in the power of drink to make reason inoperative and hence let passion rule, if we are to understand Shakespeare.' Research appears to be expending itself uneconomically to unearth such discoveries; and the critical judgment which attributes such distinctive importance to them as discoveries appears to be somewhat warped by the mere weight of musty books.

So at length Miss Campbell uses her researches to classify *Hamlet* as 'a tragedy of grief,' *Othello* 'a tragedy of jealousy,' *Lear* 'a tragedy of wrath in old age,' and *Macbeth* 'a study in fear.' Where these labels are pertinent, common sense could have affixed them without the aid of research. But their pertinence is not their striking quality. And in detail, Miss Campbell's elucidation of *Hamlet* in the light of her discoveries seems to set up relative valuations of its characters completely out of accord with the direct impressions made by the play on a normal audience in a theatre. Fortinbras becomes a much bigger figure in the dramatic economy than he is in the play, and a different fellow altogether. For Miss Campbell, the drama is a depiction of the different ways in which three men, Hamlet, Laertes and Fortinbras, bear the same grief differently because of their different 'temperaments.' Fortinbras, for her, is 'of phlegmatic, and possibly of sanguine humour,' one 'whose grief is dominated by reason.' But an audience first hears of him as a young man of unimproved mettle hot and full, who has been sharking up a band of lawless resolute: and these phrases hardly suggest a man controlled by reason. When, moreover, the audience hears of this desperado's venture, though Hamlet may justify the rashness of it in his own reason as the magnanimity which greatly finds quarrel in a straw, the audience per-

ceives that this is the outcome of Hamlet's reason and not that of the hot-blooded Fortinbras. Further, according to the theory, 'Hamlet seems to be quite clearly of the sanguine humour,' and in justification, Miss Campbell appends an official description of the sanguine humour from *The Opticke Glasse of Humors* (1607), wherein the sanguine is said to possess the attribute of 'quipping without bitter taunting' (think of Hamlet's *sotto voce* remarks when he first opens his mouth on the stage, think also of his jibes at Polonius); still another attribute of the sanguine is that 'they carry a constant loving affection to them chiefly unto whom they are endeared' (and ask for Ophelia's confirmation of this trait in Hamlet). But of course we are told by Miss Campbell that 'at the beginning of the play, Hamlet is changed from his natural humour through his excessive grief.' Why all this learned diagnosis of what he was not? And does it help to be told that now 'he is become melancholy, but his is the unnatural melancholy induced by passion, and his melancholy is inevitably the sanguine adust'? So it goes on. But this is the way of research, perhaps even that of pedantry, nowise that of criticism. It has led Miss Campbell to hold, as the result of her research, 'the conviction that Shakespeare, much more than has generally been thought, was a man familiar with the learning of his day, a student of philosophy, and a purposive artist.' Her readers, one hopes, will slip into no such conviction. If Shakespeare's creations are to be justified by the 'science' of his day, are they to stand or fall by it? And where now is the 'science' of the sixteenth century? It was Shakespeare's artistic intuitions which made him Shakespeare and the world's dramatist; by his thinking mind he was no more than a man of his times. Miss Campbell remembers that Shakespeare lived in the sixteenth century. She is in serious danger of forgetting that he was an artist.

H. B. CHARLTON.

MANCHESTER.

Hamlet: A Study in Critical Method. By A. J. A. WALDOCK. Cambridge: University Press. 1931. 99 pp. 5s.

Mr Waldock's book contains a very clear and effective summary of the main lines on which *Hamlet* has been criticised. He makes no attempt to catalogue all the varieties of opinion that have cropped up between Hanmer's suggesting that, but for Hamlet's delay, there would have been no play and the theorisings of our modern psycho- or historico-analytical-minded critics; but he manages to indicate the principal types into which they may be divided and to point out their main characteristics with an admirable economy and simplicity of statement. In his criticism he is generally happy and to the point: he fails, however, to extract from his survey any sound constructive conclusion. His underlying assumption that what can be grasped with conviction can also be expounded with certainty and simplicity undoes him. A boy with a knack for a game can understand, to the length of reproducing, strokes which twenty volumes cannot analyse and which cannot be explained to the unapt. An artist may at a blow make clear to our imagination what our intelligence can

only grasp after most laborious circuitings. Mr Waldock is for the obvious explanation. If Hamlet says he spares his uncle so that he may kill him when less well employed he must mean what he says. Naturally Mr Waldock finds the ghost's remark in the next scene about Hamlet's almost blunted purpose 'exasperating.' 'It amounts to this,' he says, 'which passage shall we notice?' The final *reductio ad absurdum* of his method may be illustrated in a phrase or two:

Bradley's *Hamlet* is better than Shakespeare's: it is better in the sense that it has a firmer consistency, that it hangs together with a more irresistible logic.

Mr Waldock's suggestion that the intuitions of men of genius given shape in an acknowledged masterpiece can be less coherent fundamentally than the attempts of lesser minds to interpret them should warn him there is a serious flaw in his reasoning. In spite of this Mr Waldock is a true lover of *Hamlet*, and his book is as a consequence an interesting contribution to the study of the play.

PETER ALEXANDER.

GLASGOW.

The Wizard by Simon Baylie. Edited by HENRY DE VOCHT. (*Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama*, New Series, vol. iv.) Louvain: Uystpruyst. 1930. cviii + 204 pp.

English scholars will always acknowledge their debt to Professor W. Bang (now Bang-Kaup), for the series *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas*, which brought distinction both to its founder and conductor and to the ancient University of Louvain from which it was issued to the world. By July, 1914, the series had extended to forty-four volumes, when the outbreak of war overwhelmed it in disaster. Professor Bang, broken-hearted, left the country of his adoption, and the fire which destroyed the famous library of the University involved also the printing-house of Uystpruyst where the unsold copies of the *Materialien* were stored. Practically all perished, and the copies now in libraries or in private hands are all that remain.

But the influence of the indefatigable founder of the series still survived. He had inspired his pupil and successor, Father Henry de Vocht, with his own enthusiasm, and in the more difficult times after the War the latter resolved to carry on his master's work. The series was to be continued with a slight change of title. It was now *Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama*. Of this four parts have been issued: a volume of Ford's plays, edited by Professor de Vocht in 1927, the fourth and fifth parts of the *Marlowe Concordance* compiled by Mr Charles Crawford, 1928 and 1929, and a first edition of *The Wizard* by Simon Baylie, edited by Professor de Vocht, 1930. And other works are in preparation. It is to be hoped that the editor's gallant enterprise will receive its due recognition in England.

Of Simon Baylie nothing is known beyond the fact that he produced *The Wizard*, apparently for a London theatre, and, as the Professor argues, about the year 1615. The play exists in two manuscripts, one

belonging to the Cathedral Library of Durham (D), the other in the British Museum as Add. MS. 10,306 (L). The transcriber of D in many places corrects his own manuscript. L, which belonged to Garrick, who bought it from Dulwich College, and afterwards to Heber, is independent of D but later. Both manuscripts have corrections by later hands. The play, which has a rather cynical tone, is concerned with the marriages of two sisters of good position, Coelia and Penelope, and their waiting woman, Delia. At the outset Coelia had been troubled with the attentions of three lovers, the old Sir Oliver Younglove, a young gallant, Sebastian, and a country bumpkin, Mr Shallow. But Antonio, Sir Oliver's eldest son, who has returned from the University and is called on to assist his father's suit, falls in love with Coelia himself. Eventually, by assuming the part of an aged wizard, he brings it about that he himself obtains Coelia. Sebastian gets Penelope and Mr Shallow Delia. The play has a rather confusing number of disguisings, and their success in each case introduces much improbability.

However, whatever its weaknesses, *The Wizard* called for an editor, and Professor de Vocht has tackled his task with the greatest thoroughness. He gives evidence that Baylie was indebted for different points to *The Wit of a Woman* 1604, N. Field's *Amends for Ladies* 1611, Marston's *Dutch Courtezan* 1605 and *What you will* 1607, Wily Beguill'd 1606, Jonson's *Silent Woman* 1609, Haughton's *Englishmen for my Money* 1601 and *Grim the Collier* 1600, R. Tailor's *The Hogge hath lost his Pearl* 1612, several of Middleton's plays, T. Heywood's *Wise Woman of Hogsdon* (? soon after 1603), Tomkis' *Albumazar* 1614 and some of Dekker's plays. On the other hand he thinks that the general resemblance between this play and J. Fletcher's *Elder Brother* is due to Fletcher's imitation of Baylie.

The Notes show Professor de Vocht's untiring industry in finding illustrations of the language of his play in contemporary literature. Perhaps here, as he himself admits, he sometimes goes too far in suggesting definite sources for phrases which were part of the common language of the time. And here and there one would be glad of a note where there is none. At l. 202 there is no doubt a pun in 'Bore-as': l. 289, query 'Say I am' (there is no reason for the repetition of 'a tough')? l. 313, 'Mine owne spawn right' surely means, 'he is the son of his father,' 'he resembles me,' the note is not clear: l. 436, 'I had.' Should this be 'I had not'? l. 468. The line would run better without 'law and': l. 584, 'Here is old seiges indeed.' The note fails to bring out the idiomatic use of 'old,' cp. *Macbeth*, II, iii, 2: l. 634, 'His Majesties,' i.e. I think, 'the Devil's,' cp. l. 651: l. 657, 'o Pthius' (explained by the editor as 'Phthius,' query 'Pythius'). Is the supposed magician addressed as representing the oracular Apollo? l. 753, 'my pendant Prophet'—surely an allusion to the legend that Mahomet's iron coffin at Mecca was suspended in the air by means of magnets in the roof above, just as the iron statue of Arsinoe at Alexandria had been suspended according to Ausonius. Professor E. Bensly refers me to the article in P. Bayle's *Dictionnaire Historique* 1720, Rotterdam, III, pp. 1861–2: l. 857. The meaning of 'reach' is not clear: ll. 1103, 1104. Perhaps a reminiscence of *Julius Caesar*, II, iv: l. 1118.

With this play on 'Lady bird,' cp. Randolph's *Amyntas*, II, iii: l. 1298, 'The prince of the air.' Is not this the Devil? Cp. *Epistle to the Ephesians* ii, 2: l. 1347, 'Obscure lie,' query 'Obscurelie'? And should not 'or' be 'was'? l. 1373, 'made,' query 'made it'? l. 1513. In the note, 'Fielding' is a slip for 'Field': l. 1922, 'struts hems.' A note would be useful.

The book is printed with the accuracy which we associate with the series. Whether it was worth while to keep 'J' for initial 'I' is a matter of opinion. To an Englishman it looks strange.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

The Disputed Revels Accounts. By A. E. STAMP. Oxford: University Press. 1930. Folio, 16 pp., and 26 Plates in collotype facsimile.

The hand of providence is shown in the making of mistakes. They are inevitable, and the world profits by them: were it otherwise the writing of history would be futile. What, however, is not so apparent is that Truth pursues her ends in devious ways, and often presses the *advocatus diaboli* into service:

thus do we of wisdom and of reach,
With windlasses and with assays of bias,
By indirections find directions out.

Shakespearean scholars have reason to feel thankful to their brother-at-arms, Dr Tannenbaum, for his rekindling some three years ago of the embers of an old controversy. Interest in the dispute over the authenticity of the Revels Accounts of 1604-5 and 1611-12 which had gone on for half a century was decidedly on the wane, and it looked as if the contest would end in a stalemate. Happily, owing to the noise made by Dr Tannenbaum's blank cartridge, officialdom has at last been frightened out of its propriety. Distracted by these detonations, the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records laid aside his bureaucratic impassivity and was moved to fine issues. The results of his rigidly scientific examination of the impugned documents, as embodied in the present book, has been to place their genuineness beyond further dispute. All the main assaults made by Dr Tannenbaum have been magnificently countered. This could not have been done, however, had not all the cards been laid on the table. Hitherto, the full documentary evidence has not been readily accessible, and investigators have been working more or less in the dark, a disadvantage which made them prone to quibble over trivialities. But now, thanks to the enterprise of the Shakespeare Association, daylight has been let in by the reproduction in exact facsimile of the whole of the two Revels Books, and all who run may read.

Mr Stamp's confutation convinces by its thoroughness. No point being shirked, all suspicion of forgery is satisfactorily dissipated. It is clear that the body of the two Revels Accounts are in the one hand, and the comparison of them—now, strange to say, first made—with the corresponding Declared Accounts very largely suffices to establish their genuineness. A careful forger with inside knowledge (such as Peter Cunningham possessed) would have examined the correlative Declared Accounts

to keep himself on the safe side, but, in this case, nothing of the sort was done. Mr Stamp shows that, through his ignorance of the Declared Accounts, Cunningham, at one particular juncture, misinterpreted the import of the later Revels Book. In other words, he did not know the meaning of his own forgery.

What is curious, in the circumstances, is that an item of important evidence in favour of his case has escaped Mr Stamp. In both Revels Accounts, the word 'called' is quaintly misspelled in more than one way but always with a single 'l.' It is to be noted that wherever this omission occurs in the account for 1611-12, the Master of the Revels, in supervising it (as Mr Stamp points out), has neatly intercalated the missing letter. But no correction of the sort has been made where the syncopation occurs in the earlier book. The secret is that at the two different periods there were two different Masters, Tylney and Buc.

It only remains to be said that Dr Tannenbaum's heavy indictment of the two Revels Books on the score of the patchy and painted appearance of the writing has been tellingly rebutted by their latest (and, I think, last-needed) champion. Mr Stamp's subtle argument concerning the worm-holes in the paper of itself establishes the antiquity of the documents in their entirety.

Now that the old ghost is laid, it is perhaps a work of supererogation to advance further evidence demonstrating the accuracy of the two long-suspected play lists, but I cannot refrain from putting on record now an item of information I stumbled across some months ago. It has important bearing on the double inclusion, under different titles, of *The City Gallant* in the list for 1611-12. Malone's interleaved and annotated copy of Langbaine's *Account of the English Dramatick Poets* is now in the Bodleian (shelf mark, Malone, 129). In vol. 1, opposite the memoir of John Cook, Malone, in his later trembling hand, disputes Oldys' absurd date for the publication of Greene's *Tu Quoque* (otherwise *The City Gallant*), and adds: 'But, unquestionably, it was not printed in 1599, and was not produced before 1609 or 1610. It was performed by Queene Anne's Servants, and acted at Court in 1611.'

Let us all say now fervently, 'Rest, rest, perturbed spirit!'

W. J. LAWRENCE.

LONDON.

Translation. An Elizabethan Art. By F. O. MATTHIESSEN. Harvard: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. viii + 232 pp. 10s. 6d.

Whoever writes about a translator undertakes the delicate task of discovering a man whose virtue it is to be self-effacing and requires therefore unusual modesty and perception. These are the saving qualities of Mr Matthiessen's book.

In presenting Elizabethan translation as an art he does not tackle the crucial question—in what sense, if any, translation as such can be called an art—but without putting too fine a point upon the matter takes it for granted that Elizabethan translators were proud to be possessed by their authors and served not as bond slaves or hirelings but as free men.

As far as this general proposition is concerned, he does not go beyond Whibley, Raleigh and Ker, the guidance and inspiration of whose pioneer work he continually acknowledges. But if he has nothing to contribute towards the theory of the art of translation, his careful observation and judgment give the book a sober value, and his genuine pleasure in the subject serves his purpose even better by tempting the appetite with the wisps of quotation and provoking a longing to return to those wide and well-flavoured pastures where the herbage is so spicy and full of juice.

His essays are all the better for being independent: he has no favourites, and refrains from exploiting one author at the expense of another. Sir Thomas Hoby and Sir Thomas North, John Florio the resolute, and Philemon Holland stand as persons, men of the world and of letters with characteristic inequalities of temper and ability. They are solid and distinct, not because Mr Matthiessen has any fresh facts to contribute towards literary biography—though he is aware of what has lately been discovered in connexion with Florio and the French Embassy—but because he has been at pains to go round by a way that has always been public, and has made his deductions from a detailed examination of the translations themselves. The use made of recent monographs and dissertations is sensible and fair. There is no special pleading, and the literary quality of the English versions in comparison with their ultimate and immediate sources is supported by quotation that is apt and sufficient but never tedious.

With the exception of a slightly ambiguous passage on p. 28, the style is plain and adequate, and once there is a fine Elizabethanism—North's words are said to 'stalk' with majesty and sureness.

Those chosen are unquestionably the big four of Elizabethan prose translators, and Mr Matthiessen is wise to insist that the making of the Authorised Version is a thing apart, but when he claims that his 'choice is not wholly arbitrary for these books (*The Courtier*, Plutarch's *Lives*, Montaigne, Livy and Suetonius) represent the scope of the entire field,' he is underestimating the importance of those who purveyed fiction. Castiglione represents but one side of the Italian contribution to the English Renaissance. It would have been well to have admitted Painter or Fenton, or some representative novelist, the inferiority of whose artistry did not make them any the less influential. It is to be doubted whether the view, twice expressed, that the social backwardness of the nation made an Englishman incapable of translating the refinement of Castiglione, is justifiable: certainly it is not proved by the account of Neapolitan hospitality quoted from Hoby's *Diary* (p. 21), the traveller is appreciative of, but not agape at the luxury of his entertainment, and would not accept the excuse made for him on this account. On the other hand, the censure of the renderings *Courtiers' trade*, *Courtliness*, *Courtiership*, and *Courting* for '*Cortegiana*' seems unnecessarily severe since no better word is suggested. As the equivalent for '*sprezzatura*' the critic offers '*negligence*' or '*nonchalance*,' but the earliest use of the latter quoted in the *New English Dictionary* is for 1678, and the former, though current, hardly seems an improvement upon the Elizabethan '*recklesnes*.'

Beyond these objections, which are small and somewhat personal, the book is singularly unpretentious and well produced.

KATHLEEN M. LEA.

CHORLEY, LANCs.

Philosophical Poems of Henry More. Edited by GEOFFREY BULLOUGH. Manchester: University Press. 1931. xc + 250 pp. 25s.

Mr Bullough is to be congratulated upon his patience and enterprise. Not very many, even among enthusiastic readers of seventeenth-century literature, feel strongly impelled to peruse with care the whole of Henry More's verse; but all serious students of the period may wish to have at their disposal some representative parts of it, together with a clear account of its significance in the history of philosophy and of poetry; and these desiderata are competently and generously provided in this edition.

For the *pièce de résistance* of his edition Mr Bullough has chosen the *Psychozoia*, wherein More combines interestingly, if somewhat mechanically, two main intentions, first to set forth the metaphysical view of life towards which he was led by his instinct to assert the spiritual quality of all experience, and then to recount his individual experience of the mystic's progress and illumination. With the *Psychozoia* the editor gives some specimens of More's shorter pieces, such as 'seemed valuable for the student of seventeenth-century literature,' and in an appendix, very usefully, a summary of More's other long poems.

Mr Bullough ably discusses in his Introduction the main influences exerted upon More's thought by other 'Platonic' or mystical writers, adding to the discussion a careful analysis and exegesis of the argument in *Psychozoia* and an account, in which much critical insight is revealed, of More's aims and achievement in poetry. 'Cambridge influences,' notably Whichcote's, and the effects of More's acquaintance with such philosophy as that of Plotinus and Ficino, are sketched with discrimination, and the unsatisfactory settlement in More's mind and poetry of the claims of intuition and reason well described. It is recognised that More's philosophical system was variously derived and that he saw none of the 'differences between Platonism, neo-Platonism, Alexandrian mysticism, theurgy, Cabbalism, and modern Italian commentary'; but in the Introduction only those elements in More's Platonism are summarised which may help in the interpretation of *Psychozoia*. This is certainly a justifiable method, but the question may be hazarded whether the picture of More's mental life might not gain in accuracy by some further attention to his knowledge of Hermetic and other occult literature. It may also be questioned whether More is not presented a trifle too exclusively as the product of his own reading and whether it might not be possible to distinguish a little more nicely between what was borrowed and deliberate in his thought and inspiration and what was individual and instinctive. This, however, would involve a psychological enquiry of great difficulty, and Mr Bullough's work is none the less admirable for his discretion in holding to the more ascertainable facts.

Mr Bullough well resists any temptation to attribute to this poetry more artistic value than can justly be claimed for it, and rightly concentrates upon its historical significance and its relationships, the Spenserian or the 'metaphysical.' In this salutary avoidance he may have done something less than justice to More's literary capabilities, for, although these were not very striking, More's verses have now and then an imaginative and rhythmical charm which might have been more strongly emphasised without loss of balance; 'logician, metaphysician...' and if not 'bard' yet one who could show a respectable vein of verse rhetoric.

The text seems to be reproduced with nearly sufficient fidelity to the edition of 1647, though both in the text and elsewhere it is not as difficult as it should be to find misprints. 'solf' on p. 19 (23, 2) is a double error, the true reading being 'soft.' In More's 'Preface to the Reader' there are three misprints on one page (p. 8), *οὐμ* for *οὐν*, *ὀ* for *ὄ*, and 'live' for 'lives,' and also the alteration of the common form 'aswell' to 'as well.' In the bibliography 'Synesius' is unnecessarily Gallicised to 'Synésius,' 'Patrologiae' becomes 'Patrologie' and '*Studies in Philology*' '*Studies in Philosophy*.' It was hardly requisite to have given in footnotes to the text all the instances in which the 1642 edition of *Psychozoia* has italic for the roman forms of 1647; still less to have informed students of the kind for whom this edition is apparently intended that for 'carried' or 'unmoved' Grosart's edition reads 'carryèd' or 'unmovèd'; and least of all to cite Grosart's mistakes. There is enough evidence of care to suggest that Mr Bullough's text is to be trusted where it differs from that of his predecessor.

The explanatory notes excellently continue the work begun in the Introduction, though certain words call for comment which they do not receive. It might have been indicated that the *New English Dictionary* quotes no parallel to More's 'rine' (p. 195) for 'rime' (frost), though there is no doubt as to the reading, since 'rine' rhymes with 'shine.' 'Thorough-siping' (p. 89) and 'rid' (p. 32) also require elucidation.

The edition would have been improved by the insertion of catch-headings at the top of the pages in text and commentary, facilitating reference, and by the use of page numbers, and not merely stanza and line numbers, at the beginnings of the notes.

L. C. MARTIN.

LIVERPOOL.

The Matchless Orinda. By PHILIP WEBSTER SOUERS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. viii + 326 pp. 15s.

This is a worthy addition to the *Harvard Studies in English*, a clear, pleasingly written, and convincing delineation of Katherine Philips, her life, character, friendships, and literary endeavours. No extravagant claims are made as to the value of her work, but a sane and competent estimate of her achievement is given, particularly in the excellent final chapter, where a summary of her merits and deficiencies and an account of her relationships in poetry are attempted. Mr Souers has been very

successful in bringing out the charm that was evidently a part of Orinda's personality and was doubtless, as he suggests, closely connected with the fact that such affectations as she may have had were all superficial, and beneath them was a solid substratum of kindly and genuine humanity. Her letters to 'Poliarchus,' Sir Charles Cotterell, are discussed with some fullness, and the treatment of her acquaintance or correspondence with Jeremy Taylor, Henry Vaughan and others is lively and informative.

There are one or two blemishes, such as the repetition on p. 141 of matter already presented on p. 130, and the unfortunate misreading on p. 220 from a MS. letter of 'repeat' for 'repent,' which appears in the facsimile given opposite and which stultifies the argument on a later page. There are several other deviations from strict fidelity in the few lines here transcribed.

None the less, the impression remains that Mr Souers's study is essentially accurate and sound.

L. C. MARTIN.

LIVERPOOL.

Abraham Cowley: The Muses' Hannibal. By ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT.
London: Oxford University Press. 1931. 380 pp. 12s. 6d.

In this full-length biography Professor Nethercot has brought together nearly all the known data and has added other information which his own industry has brought to light. Cowley is presented not as an abstraction, a 'metaphysical poet,' but in all the versatility of mind and endeavour which not only lay behind his 'metaphysical' inclinations but gave him much of his quality and eminence as a member of society.

Cowley's own writings in verse and prose are the best index to his personality, and Professor Nethercot has freely drawn upon them, without, it must be confessed, achieving that full vitality of portraiture which marks the best sort of biography, since we learn from him rather what Cowley did and experienced than what he was. None the less Professor Nethercot has made much good use of his materials.

When certainty fails, inference and conjecture are admissible, provided that they are in themselves worth making, are kept within control and are rendered clearly distinguishable from facts. Professor Nethercot usually satisfies these conditions, but he appears at times to strain them somewhat. Thus, although, as he himself admits on p. 278, the writings of seventeenth-century poets in their elegiac moods hardly afford a firm basis for historical statement, he yet tells us of the poet's relationship with William Hervey, that 'Not a tree or a bird in the neighbourhood but was familiar to them as they lay in the shade of the one and listened to the trillings of the other . . .'; and chiefly, it would seem, on the score of Cowley's lines in the same poem:

To him my *Muse* made haste with every strain
Whilst it was new, and warm yet from the *Brain*,

we are informed that the ode 'Of Wit' 'was obviously written first for Hervey's eye'; when the most that can safely be said is not 'was obviously'

but 'may have been.' The answer to the question 'Whom could the final stanza fit but Hervey?' is not so self-evident as Professor Nethercot assumes. And there are other points at which arbitrariness or inaccuracy may seem to impair the value of his work. Thus on p. 11 we read: 'Cowley's choice of a subject [in his *Pyramus and Thisbe*] proves incontrovertibly that his Latin studies had already introduced him to Ovid (for there is no indication that he knew the translation of the *Metamorphoses* which George Sandys had published in 1626).' But, to go no further, Dunstan Gale's *Pyramus and Thisbe* was published in the same year (possibly earlier, see *D.N.B.*), and though Cowley may well have met the story first in Ovid's pages we are hardly in the sphere of incontrovertible proof. On p. 49 Crashaw's translation of *La Strage degli Innocenti* is attributed to 1646, the year in which it was published, whereas a MS. dated 1637 is extant. And on p. 52, when Professor Nethercot is collecting an array of usages which were 'undoubtedly' suggested to Milton by the *Davideis*, he includes 'the sonorous use of proper names' which is surely to cast an uncritical reflection upon the scope of Milton's reading. More surprising still is the concluding reflection in the same paragraph: Milton's borrowings are so numerous 'that the vast difference in the success of the two poems is more than ever to be marvelled at'; for were the borrowings ten times as many as they are the difference between Cowley's talent and Milton's genius would still border on the infinite. Professor Nethercot, however, proves his critical balance by his temperate estimate, at the end of his book, of Cowley's claims upon our attention.

He is discreet too in his treatment of Cowley's activities as a royalist agent, and of his attitude to the leaders of the Commonwealth. It is in this connexion, particularly, that his own researches tell. It would have been better if Professor Nethercot had made it clearer to what extent he has had recourse to documents, in the Public Record Office and elsewhere, other than those specifically mentioned in his bibliography: to the Roman Transcripts for instance, or to the reports of the Historical MSS. Commission. It certainly appears questionable at one point whether he has actually seen a document which he mentions and which has been printed. He refers (pp. 115 and 118) to a certain letter quoted in the *Clarendon State Papers* (II, 279) of which the full text shows that Cowley was suspected of implication in a scheme to yield Jersey to the French; Professor Nethercot, however, only mentions Jermyn, and not Cowley, as an object of this suspicion¹.

The style of the book is straightforward and clear, the arrangement of the material orderly and for the most part logical. Here and there, however, it seems a little difficult to follow the sequence, as in the following sentence (of Charles I): 'He had been a good husband to her, according to royal standards, and she had borne him three sons and three daughters, as well as three other children who died in their infancy.' There are a few

¹ This, together with other slight deficiencies in historical detail, was pointed out to me by Mr F. J. Routledge, of the University of Liverpool, who has been working for many years upon the Clarendon Papers in the Bodleian Library.

misprints and other corrigenda, of which Professor Nethercot is probably by this time himself aware. But the last word must be one not of cavilling at minor blemishes but of praise for the care and industry that have gone to the making of this competent biography and estimate.

L. C. MARTIN.

LIVERPOOL.

William Congreve. By D. CRANE TAYLOR. Oxford: University Press. 1931. 252 pp. 12s. 6d.

The recent revival of public interest in Congreve, which Mr Taylor notes in his preface, was almost bound to produce a new biography. But setting that aside, this new study of Congreve owes its existence, in some part at least, to the chronic twentieth-century habit of book-making. Mr Taylor has discovered some new facts about Congreve, and corrected a number of errors that persisted in Sir Edmund Gosse's revised memoir; but it is questionable whether his researches justified the writing of a new book. All that he has to add to our knowledge of Congreve might have been put into a more compact form for the readers of this or some other periodical.

If Sir Edmund Gosse, in Mr Taylor's words, 'had not the time for an exhaustive study of any one author,' the present biographer may justifiably claim that he has been over the ground thoroughly. On the other hand, he is apt to fall into errors whenever he steps aside from Congreve. The statement (p. 216) that 'in 1718, Tom Brown, the scandalmonger of Grub Street, issued two volumes entitled *Familiar Letters of Love, Gallantry, etc.*' is a somewhat serious example of the inaccuracies to be met with in this book. In 1718 Tom Brown had been dead for fourteen years. In a note on Mrs Pix (p. 136), Mr Taylor, following apparently the *Dictionary of National Biography*, puts her death conjecturally in the year 1720. This date never seems to have been corrected; but Mrs Pix was dead by the year 1709. The *Post Boy*, May 26-28, 1709, advertises a performance of Mrs Centlivre's *Busy Body* 'for the Benefit of the Family of Mrs Mary Pix, deceas'd,' and adds that she wrote the greater part of that play and of *The Gamester*. That is a small point; but elsewhere Mr Taylor leaves one in doubt as to his knowledge of theatrical conditions at the beginning of the eighteenth century. He states (p. 162) that Congreve's five plays 'afforded him a steady income. Some of them were performed every year for the remainder of his life.' If Mr Taylor has evidence that Congreve was receiving benefits year after year from his plays, he might usefully have produced it; for it was not the habit of the patentees to reward their authors in this way. Had it been so, such an author as Farquhar would never have died in poverty; *Sir Harry Wildair* alone would have been sufficient to keep him in comfortable circumstances for the rest of his days. On p. 202, *Squire Bickerstaff Detected* is, as usual, attributed to Yalden, Rowe, and Congreve, but the authority for this ascription is not stated. Perhaps Mr Taylor had some doubts as to Congreve's share in the pamphlet, for he leaves it out of his bibliography

on p. 231. It is only fair to add that the critical part of this book is far better than the biographical. Occasionally Mr Taylor makes a statement that might with advantage be qualified, e.g. (p. 161): 'It is safe to say that no writer in English literature has commanded so varied a prose technique,' but on the whole he shows sufficient sense and good taste in this part of his task (cf. his defence of Congreve's attitude to authorship, p. 218) to make one regret that he did not confine himself to a purely critical piece of work.

J. R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

A Scottish Man of Feeling: Some Account of Henry Mackenzie, Esq., of Edinburgh, of the Golden Age of Burns and Scott. By HAROLD WILLIAM THOMPSON. Oxford: University Press. 1931. xviii + 463 pp. 15s.

Two ideas give coherence and sustained interest to this very discursive account of the life and times of Mackenzie: one, that his life, at least the latter part of it, coincided with the golden age of Scottish art, literature, and learning; the other, that this golden age was distinctively the age of sentiment. Throughout that period, the author of *The Man of Feeling* was a great personage in Edinburgh society; he was the doyen of Scottish letters, he introduced the German romantics to English readers, he prepared the way for Burns, at least for the poet's friendly reception even by the most dignified circles in Edinburgh, he helped to found the invaluable Highland Society, and during the two disturbed decades following the French Revolution he played an influential part in Scottish politics. This admirable complement to *The Anecdotes and Egotisms of Henry Mackenzie*, edited by Dr Thompson in 1927, deserves a hearty welcome.

Mackenzie certainly comes to life in these pages. His biographer has succeeded in putting us at the right point of view, and made him as attractive and important a figure as he appeared to those who thought and felt in the ways peculiar to that day. Edinburgh, for the time being, seems the hub of the universe, and the importance of the events then shaking the world is measured by their reactions in the Scottish capital. All that is excellent in a biography. But this is also a contribution to literary history, and some of Dr Thompson's analogies and generalisations, though plausible and suggestive, are pushed a little far.

It would be unfair to complain that Mackenzie himself is made to appear too important. He is known to everyone as having written a book called *The Man of Feeling*, which, as a matter of fact, has long been the least read of all the sentimental novels of any standing. But if *The Man of Feeling* or any other of Mackenzie's works had never been published, the literary history of sentimentalism would have been much the same as it is. Mackenzie was a sign of the times rather than one of the age's artisans. Even Scottish literature would have been pretty much what it is without him; Burns, who was the typical Man of Feeling only in his

inferior work in the conventional English style, would have been recognised sooner or later as the national poet; Macpherson would have sentimentalised in his pseudo-Ossianic rhapsodies. But it is Mackenzie's place in Scottish literary history that is the point; and, unquestionably, he who was called by Burns and Scott the 'Scottish Addison,' and whose works were edited first by Scott and then by Galt, was as imposing a figure in his time and place as Dr Johnson was in the London of the Georges.

Nor can we be anything else than thankful to Dr Thompson for his account of the inroads of sentimentalism in Scottish literature at that time. But he sees sentimentalism everywhere. Hardly anyone in that age escapes the infection, even Fielding has it, according to Dr Thompson, Fielding, who was so quick at detecting the disease in others. Grant that *Amelia* is a sentimental novel, though only in a certain limited sense; are we going to agree that Parson Adams is a Man of Feeling, Tom Jones a Man of Feeling, in the sense indicated by the capital letters? In spite of Dr Thompson's denial, there is a great deal more sentimentalism in Smollett, in the tawdry love business in *Roderick Random* and *Peregrine Pickle*, and in some parts of *Humphry Clinker*. Then, not only are we told that Burns is another Man of Feeling, but the list includes Scott, on account of his sentimental heroes and heroines, Rogers and Campbell, whom we need not quarrel about, Byron, De Quincey, and Carlyle, the catalogue winding up with the Right Hon. Ramsay Macdonald. American literature of the time of Washington Irving and W. C. Bryant is marked by sentimentalism. There is plenty of it also, for the matter of that, in Dickens and Thackeray, who are not mentioned. Dr Thompson traces the sentimental tradition in some of Stevenson's best work, although he would hesitate to declare that writer's philosophy of life 'thoroughly sentimental.' His remarks on the Kailyard School are very much to the point, except that he omits the founder, or refounder, George Macdonald.

But in this lumping together of writers whose sentimentalism was of very different kinds and degrees and not of the same provenance, our critic disregards certain obvious distinctions. Let us be wary of using the word 'feeling' in its literal meaning, for what is healthy and normal, the beating of the heart checked or perchance not duly checked by the critical attention of the brain, and then figuratively for that conscious or unconscious indulgence in the luxury of emotion which Meredith described as 'fiddling harmonics on the strings of sensualism.' The bad odour into which sentimentalism has fallen in later times, especially among the self-elect who shun it as nervously as they shun a split infinitive, is due largely to Meredith's satirical clairvoyance. Literature in the period under review had a bad attack of this hypertrophy of feeling. Sterne had it and liked being ill: he hugged his tender-heartedness as fondly as Young and the other graveyard poets hugged their melancholy. Sir James Barrie also knows that he has got it in the blood, and tries with varying success to make a jest of it.

We have well-nigh forgotten that Mackenzie was the Scottish Addison; hence the account of the *Mirror* and the *Lounger* will introduce readers

to prose that is in many respects superior to his fiction. The chapter headed 'Metromania' will hardly do as much for his verse, although Dr Thompson affirms 'Kenneth' to be 'the finest romantic ballad composed in Britain in the eighteenth century.' Mackenzie himself would probably have been not only too modest, but also too shrewd a judge to countenance such a verdict. He was one of those who appreciated Chatterton's old-style poems, although revolted by the coarseness of *Kew Gardens*. But this and several other chapters on neglected aspects of Scottish literary and social history are studies evincing careful investigation, wide scholarship, and an engaging liveliness, for which we are grateful.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

LONDON.

Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism. Edited by THOMAS MIDDLETON RAYSOR. London: Constable. 1930. Vol. I, lxi + 256 pp.; Vol. II, 375 pp. 42s.

Coleridge's criticism on Shakespeare has come down to us in fragmentary condition, made up from marginalia in two editions of *Shakespeare's Works*, from various note-books and manuscripts, and from shorthand transcripts and reports by various listeners. H. N. Coleridge in *Literary Remains* wove together from these sources as connected a piece of criticism as he could. In the notes on *Hamlet*, for example, he begins with a paragraph from the *Bristol Gazette's* report of the lectures of 1813; then comes an extract from a note-book containing material for these lectures; again we return to the report, to come next on passages from a manuscript used for lectures in 1818, then to notes from the Stockdale edition of *Shakespeare's Works*, back to the 1818 manuscript, and in this way from one source to the other till the end. This method brings rapidly under the eye material that the reader has to compare and digest for himself when it is presented under its various headings. But every student must desire to have before him as far as possible what Coleridge himself actually wrote in the form in which he left it, and where this is impossible to know exactly the source of the remaining material: this he can find in Mr Raysor's volumes. Instead of H. N. Coleridge's compilation which occupies the body of Ashe's edition of *Coleridge's Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare*—a volume the student must always be very grateful for—instead of the slight expansions and alterations thought necessary to secure a smooth appearance, we have in appropriate sections and as they were left by their author the marginalia, lecture notes, and fragments, as well as the extant reports of the lectures which occupy the second volume. To pay two guineas for this in place of the two shillings for the earlier version seems a heavy toll, but libraries must face it and no student who can afford it will think his money ill spent.

Throughout the two volumes the reader has the help of Mr Raysor's valuable notes, fixing dates, giving cross-references, explaining allusions; and his preface is an admirable introduction to this side of Coleridge's work. He indicates Coleridge's place among the English critics of Shake-

speare, and discusses briefly but adequately his debt to the German criticism of his own day. The vexed question of Coleridge's borrowings from Schlegel is handled with knowledge and understanding. One has space only for his conclusion on the dispute about their priority as interpreters of Hamlet:

[The matter] is of less importance than Coleridge thought, since his independence is fairly clear, and since, moreover, his interpretation of Hamlet is so much more sympathetic, penetrating and comprehensive than Schlegel's that he could even forego the claim of independence without loss. His superiority over Schlegel in such a comparison is overwhelming.

The important reference in the first note on p. 18 (Vol. I) should read II, 272-5 instead of 666-71.

PETER ALEXANDER.

GLASGOW.

Die Verwendung des Konjunktivs im Altenglischen. Von HANS GLUNZ. (*Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, XI.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1930. xvi + 144 pp. 10 M.

Die Komparation der Adjektiva und Adverbien im Altenglischen. (*Altenglische Forschungen*, LXX.) Von FRITZ SEELIG. Heidelberg: C. Winter. 1930. xi + 79 pp. 5 M.

Zur Geographie und Chronologie des angelsächsischen Wortschatzes. Von GUNTHER SCHERER. Berlin. 1928. 61 pp.

Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittelenglischen. Von H. W. HÄUSERMANN. (*Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, LIV.) Vienna: W. Braumüller. 1930. viii + 86 pp. 5 M.

Studien zur Syntax in den Werken Geoffrey Chaucers. Von FRITZ KARPF. (*Wiener Beiträge*, LV.) Vienna: W. Braumüller. 1930. xiv + 148 pp. 8 M.

Various problems of Old and Middle English grammar are dealt with by these authors, and the most important contribution is Dr Glunz's work in which he collects and investigates a large number of instances of the conjunctive used to denote interest and possibility; his notes on indirect speech (pp. 101 ff.) are especially interesting. The author traces the connexion between the use of the conjunctive in O.E. and its use in Primitive Germanic and Indo-European as 'a form of expression which has in almost every single case of its use some other signification' without any clear distinction in the transition between the separate notions represented, and its later use where, in spite of superficial changes in form, the essential notions of interest and condition (as determined by the author) remain essentially the same. The book provides probably one of the best logical approaches to the subject. Dr Seelig is concerned with more detailed aspects of grammatical forms and his work includes a discussion of the original Germanic suffixes denoting comparative and superlative, with and without mutation, as well as collections of numerous examples of each type from O.E. adjectives and adverbs (arranged

alphabetically with oblique cases added and all properly documented). A different problem is dealt with by Dr Scherer, and his interesting dissertation is an attempt at distinguishing certain elements of O.E. vocabulary as Anglian or Saxon, based in the first place upon two versions of Bishop Wærferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*, but with much parallel evidence from other sources. On the whole this little book is of high quality so far as it goes, and besides correcting some errors it adds much to Jordan's *Eigentümlichkeiten des angl. Wortschatzes*, published twenty-five years ago.

In dealing with 'Aktionsart' in early Middle English Dr Häusermann adopts Streitberg's definitions and terminology and collects his material from Layamon's *Brut*, *King Horn* and *Havelock*, arranging it under two heads, perfect and imperfect. He shows that the feeling for 'Perfektivität' and 'Imperfektivität' was not lost in Middle English although there were changes in the corresponding forms of linguistic expression. The significance of O.E. verbal prefixes *ge-*, *a-*, *to-*, etc., are dealt with in so far as they affect the thesis and—what is perhaps a greater virtue—the actual significance of the verbs under consideration is borne in mind. The essays by Dr Karpf on Chaucer's syntax (the first part only is published) include studies on Chaucer's usage as regards gender with notes on personal gender of inanimate objects, animals, etc., and suffixes (the author still regards *-estre* as a feminine suffix and does not mention Jespersen's article in *Mod. Lang. Review*, xxii, pp. 129 ff.); there are also sections on number, congruence, comparison and ellipsis; altogether a useful collection of examples.

A. H. SMITH.

LONDON.

Die Sprache Caxtons. Von HELMUT WIENCKE. (*Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten*, xi.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1930. 226 pp. 14 M.

Edward Bysshe's Dictionary of Rhymes (1702). By ARVID GABRIELSON. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell. 1930. xv + 87 pp. 5 kr.

Die Londoner Vulgärsprache in Thackerays Yellowplush Papers. Von K. STEUERWALD. (*Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, xiv.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1930. 63 pp. 4 M.

Neuenglisch o gesprochen wie u. Von HELMUT ZWERINA. Leipzig: Mayer und Müller. 1930. 87 pp. 5 M. 40.

Zu den Lautverhältnissen der Lancashire-Dialekte. Von HUGO BRÖKER. Leipzig: Mayer und Müller. 1930. 54 pp. 3 M. 80.

The publication of new materials for the history of modern English is an attractive line of philology; in the main they tend only to confirm what scholars like Wyld and Zachrisson have already concluded and emend generally only in minor details, but as corroborative evidence such works are worth a welcome. Dr Wiencke's book deals with the earlier period, and in it he makes a fresh examination of the phonology and grammar of the Germanic and French elements in Caxton's language (as

preserved in *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye, Jason, Aesop and Eneydos*). All spelling variants are noted, though even such a minute examination tends to throw little new light on the problem of Caxton's language, unless perhaps by a more careful selection of the works for the study and the rejection of works printed by Caxton but written or translated by others. Dr Wiencke has corrected some errors in an old work by Römstedt on the same problem (*Die englische Schriftsprache bei Caxton*, Göttingen, 1891), and by a more detailed investigation has shown that Caxton's language was not necessarily so conservative as is usually held. Even so the author makes little attempt to re-estimate Caxton's position in the history of literary English. Bysshe belonged to the eighteenth century and his *Art of English Poetry* included a Dictionary of Rhymes ('most proper for the Rhymes of Heroick Poetry,' omitting 'all burlesque Words, all uncommon Words, and all Base, Low Words'). He recognised that 'as there are several Words whose Terminations, tho' different in Writing, are pronounced alike, there are others that agree in Orthography, but differ in Sound.' This is a sound principle, but, as Professor Gabrielson points out, the phonetic reliability of a rhyming dictionary is a thing to be proved. Therefore in drawing his conclusions from the more interesting of Bysshe's rhymes the author makes much use of collateral evidence from other sources, and in particular he draws frequently upon Coles, *The Compleat English Schoolmaster*, 1674, and Turner, *The Art of Spelling and Reading English*, 1710, two sources which Professor Gabrielson informs us have not been used for English philology before. The work largely confirms what has been already written on the subject, but it is unquestionably an important account of English pronunciation in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Despite the fact that much of Bysshe's Dictionary is of no use for the author's immediate purpose the value of the more interesting information could be better estimated by the reader if more than a single page of the original work had been reprinted; it would certainly have been more convenient. Another source has been approached by Dr Steuerwald who has produced an informative essay on nineteenth-century Cockney with many examples of significant spellings from the *Yellowplush Papers*. The material is arranged phonologically and there is a short section on grammatical forms. It should be noted that many of the forms cited (like *sperrit* for *spirit*, *yaller* for *yellow*) are not necessarily peculiar to London English. Dr Zwerina's study is more historical and his examples of words spelled *o* but pronounced *u* are drawn from M.E. texts and the works of grammarians and phoneticians of a later period. In his explanation of this usage he notes the scribal confusion between *o* and *u* in M.E., the development of O.E. *ō* to *ū* under labial influence (*oven*, *shovel*, etc.), and one or two other commonly accepted versions of sound changes in late M.E. and early Modern English. Lastly one might note here Dr Bröker's short dissertation on some of the phonetic characteristics of modern south Lancashire dialects (based on phonograph records); there are a few notes on the historical developments from M.E., though the results of Ekwall's survey of Lancashire place-names are not at all considered. There is also a short

survey of the principal figures in Lancashire dialect literature from the eighteenth century.

A. H. SMITH.

LONDON.

Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Von W. MEYER-LÜBKE. 3. neu bearbeitete Auflage. Lief. 1-6 (A—Kok). Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1930-31. 384 pp. Each 2 M. 50.

La première édition de ce dictionnaire a paru de 1911 à 1920; la deuxième, qui date de 1924, était une pure et simple réimpression. La présente, à en juger d'après les livraisons 1-6, les seules qui aient paru jusqu'ici (fin octobre 1931), est, de toute évidence, suivant la formule consacrée, une édition 'revue, corrigée et considérablement augmentée.' Non seulement le nombre de pages est supérieur (384 pp. contre 340 pour les articles de A—Kok), mais il y a aussi de nouvelles discussions d'étymologies, une documentation bibliographique tenue au courant, de notables additions de formes dialectales¹ etc. On aura d'ailleurs une idée suffisante de l'œuvre de révision à laquelle l'auteur a procédé en jetant un coup d'œil sur les deux groupes ci-dessous, que nous avons établis d'après des sondages pratiqués en divers endroits du livre (1-100; 900-1000; 1600-1700; 2500-2600). Le groupe A contient les mots de la troisième édition qui ne se trouvent pas dans les deux premières éditions; le groupe B contient l'indication des articles qui existaient dans les deux premières éditions et qui ont été soit supprimés soit complètement refondus dans la troisième².

A.

1a, aanmarren; 31a, ablūmen; 33a, abölēre; 42a, absēntāre; 51a, abu kirdan; 51b, ab ūlra; 55a, abu taqa; 58a, academiā; 71a, *acchordare; 71b, *acchordium; 77, acclīnāre³; 87a, accūbitāre; 97a, *acervale; 97b, *acēteus; 901a, Baligant; 908a, bālla; 908b, ballan; 933a, bann; 936a, *banvos; 937a, baptismus; 937b, Baptista; 941a, barbaḥḥane; 942a, baranka; 943a, baratta; 944a, Barbarie; 956a, bardí; 958a, bari; 963a, *barranca; 970a, bas drinken; 973a, basiliscus; 992a, *batlinia; 992b, batrachus; 998a, batze, bātze; 1000a, baubāre; 1602a, *cannata; 1602b, cannēlla; 1619a, cantor, -ōre; 1624a, caper; 1624b, caperāre; 1639a, capitulārius; 1659a, *capsea; 1659b, capsēlla; 1659c, *capseum; 1662a, captīvitas, -āte; 1672a, caracalla; 1672b, caracūlum; 1673a, caragius; 1673b, *carāvōs; 1688a, carēre; 1688b, carēre; 1694a, caristia;

¹ Cf. 3755, 4, *gĩmbus où sass. dzurumba, log. rumba, cors. rumbozu sont donnés en addition à cerign. ėumme, anep. gumbo et log. dzumburu.

² Nous reproduisons ici la notation de la quantité telle que l'auteur l'indique. On ne manquera pas de se demander quel système l'auteur a adopté. Peut-être nous expliquera-t-il en sa préface pourquoi par exemple il écrit *baptismus* et *Baptista*; *dēcērpēre*, *dēlērāre*, *dēmēntīcāre*, *dēpērdēre*, **dēprōnāre*, *dēpūrāre*, *dērīvāre*, et *defīgūrāre*, *defrīcāre*, *delīnctus*, *delīnquere*; pourquoi dans ces deux derniers mots il écrit: *delīnctus* et *delīnquēre*; pourquoi *accūbītāre* et **acchordare*, etc.

³ Devant *acclīnāre* ce n'est pas 77 qu'il eût fallu mettre, mais 76a.

1696a, *carium; 1699a, Carmine (Madonna del); 2500a, dēcērpēre; 2507a, decretum; 2518a, defigūrāre; 2520a, defricāre; 2532a, dēlērāre; 2541a, delinctus; 2541b, delinquēre; 2543a, *delōcāre; 2550a, dēmēnticāre; 2570a, dēpērdēre; 2575a, *dēprōnāre; 2576a, dēpūrāre; 2580a, *dercos; 2582a, *dergos; 2585a, dērīvāre; 2585b, derua; 2587a, *dērva, *dērvila; 2596a, dēsōlāre.

B.

3, *aballīna; 22, ab hōc (remplacé par 567, apud); 26, *abietinus; 36, aboogerdan (remplacé par 51a, abu kirdan); 40, abscisa; 54, abusio; 60, acathartus; 64, *accapitiare; 74, accisa¹; 83, *accordare; 84, *accōrdium (remplacés respectivement par 71a, *acchordare, 71b, *acchordium); 99, acharistia; 903, balg; 924, ban (remplacé par 933a, bann); 928, *bandōn; 953, *barcella; 979, *bastardus; 987, batana; 993, bātsarra; 1601, çannach; 1605, *cannius; 1646, *cappulare; 1667, *capunculum; 1669, çaqr; 1678, carcannum; 1696, carium (remplacé par 1696a, *carium); 2502, *decīdentare; 2522, *degelare; 2523, *degradus; 2530, dejicere; 2562, *dentiare.

Parmi les ouvrages de lexicologie auxquels M. Meyer-Lübke a eu recours pour compléter ses deux premières éditions, il faut citer en premier lieu le *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* de Walther von Wartburg, dont le premier fascicule date de 1922 et dont le 20^e vient de paraître, ce qui nous mène, fin octobre 1931, à 426 p. (dernier article: *fascina*)². Puis vient le dictionnaire de Ernst Gamillscheg, qui a paru de 1926-1929 et qui a été pour Meyer-Lübke l'occasion de nombreuses références³. Enfin il a eu l'excellente idée de consulter *Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus latina*, de D. S. Blondheim, qui lui a fourni quelques formes des plus intéressantes. Mais il n'aurait pas dû s'arrêter en si bon chemin. Il connaît certainement les divers travaux relatifs aux gloses hébraïco-romanes et il n'est pas trop tard peut-être pour espérer qu'il étudiera ces gloses et qu'il incorporera les résultats de son examen dans les fascicules qui ne sont pas encore imprimés, quitte à établir un supplément pour les parties de l'ouvrage déjà parues. Quant au lecteur, il trouvera une bibliographie de ces recueils de *loazim* dans le livre ci-dessus mentionné de D. S. Blondheim. Il pourra y ajouter Arsène Darmesteter et D. S. Blondheim, *Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi*, T. I, *Texte des gloses*, Paris, 1929, et Raphael Levy, *The astrological works of Abraham ibn Ezra* dans *Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, Baltimore, 1927.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

LONDON.

¹ Devant *accismāre* ce n'est pas 74 qu'il eût fallu mettre, mais 75; corriger aussi 78, *acclinis* en 77.

² Cf. 1, a, ab; 4, abante; 5, *abantiāre; 6, abarka; 11, abbat(u)ēre; 12, *abbībērāre, etc.

³ Cf. 252, *afannare (discussion de *advanno); 315b, alban(i)us (discussion de *alibann); 477, *ankya; 560, apricāre; 863, *baccalāris, etc.

La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française au XVII^e siècle. Par GEORGES ASCOLI. (*Travaux et Mémoires de l'Université de Lille. Droit-Lettres, Nouvelle Série, Fascicule 13.*) Paris: J. Gamber. 1930. Vol. I, viii + 517 pp.; Vol. II, 360 pp.

All who have had occasion to use M. Ascoli's earlier volume (*La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la Guerre de Cent Ans jusqu'à la fin du seizième siècle*, Paris, 1927) will welcome this continuation of his work. As time went on, French interest in British affairs increased and became more articulate through the development of pamphlet literature and the periodic press; M. Ascoli's task has accordingly been rendered more difficult in the later period by abundance and complexity of material. That he should have completed it within three years of his earlier volume is in itself a testimony to his appetite for work. I am tempted to apply to it his own description of Camden's *Analecta anglo-britannica*—'chef-d'œuvre d'érudition patiente.' The increasing complexity of his subject has compelled the author to adopt a more rigorous classification of his material than he had used in his earlier work, where a more or less chronological arrangement was possible.

The new work falls into three great divisions. In Book I, English events are studied in chronological sequence with their repercussions in France; naturally the author is forced to recount a great deal of history which is already familiar to the English reader, but the angle from which it is considered is a new one, and it is instructive to view our own history in the light of foreign prejudices. The political history of Britain, its transpires, was infinitely more accessible and more widely familiar to the mass of the French people than any aspect of social or intellectual life. The struggle between James I and the Pope over the rival claims of temporal and spiritual authority was followed in France with passionate interest. Charles I's marriage to a French princess increased the sympathy extended to the Royalist party in the Civil War, and the universal horror at the execution of the King; even when reasons of state induced the French government to recognise Cromwell and receive his ambassadors, public opinion, though forced into unwilling admiration of his statesmanship, continued to execrate him as a regicide. Catholic hopes, disappointed by Charles II, rose high again at the accession of James II, and the Revolution of 1688, though bloodless, shocked the French almost as deeply as that of 1648, confirming their impression of the English as a disloyal and lawless people. Sympathy with the exiled Stuarts waxed and waned according to their personal popularity. About this time, however, M. Ascoli notes the beginnings of organised polemic warfare to capture public opinion. Pamphlets, lampoons, and songs solicited popular favour on behalf of William of Orange or of Louis XIV. M. Ascoli does not stop, as his title would seem to indicate, at the close of the seventeenth century, but carries us on to the close of Anne's reign, with the passing of the Stuart dynasty and the prospect of 'une entente cordiale et durable.' The final chapter of the section is a retrospective review of the interest shown by the French in Britain's past history.

Book II deals with French knowledge of Britain itself and of its in-

habitants. The types of the latter to be met with in France are described—traders, beggars, soldiers of fortune, Scots scholars, Catholic refugees, exiled Royalists, diplomatic representatives, and travellers for pleasure. M. Ascoli analyses the printed works—descriptions, guides, etc.—at the disposal of the Frenchman visiting England; then, from the various travellers' accounts, describes the journey and summarises the visitors' impressions of London and of such limited regions of the provinces as they visited. Beyond Oxford and Cambridge—shrewdly criticised—and the favoured health resorts of the day, Bath, Tunbridge, and Epsom, little was known of England; of Scotland, no longer in political sympathy with France, and the home of the 'fanatiques puritains,' even less; of Wales and of Ireland, nothing, save that the latter country appeared to James II's French followers as a desolate waste inhabited by a handful of beggars. The travellers' notes on English social life are interesting and often amusing. Almost all are convinced that the English marry in haste and repent at leisure; the women, in particular, are headstrong in following their passions. The English are great eaters, great drinkers, great smokers, great arguers and public-house politicians. When not roused to argument they are taciturn and reserved. They have the reputation of profound thinkers. They are proud, obstinate, courageous; their sincerity and loyalty make them good friends; they fear illness more than death, and almost every French visitor remarks on the frequency of suicide in England. The English are individualists and care less for public opinion than the French. The various classes of society are clearly distinguished yet mingle freely, and the lower orders show an independence of thought and action which scandalises the visitors. Considerable space is devoted by many of these to describing the various religious sects, and especially the Quakers, in answer, evidently, to the demands of public curiosity in France. M. Ascoli ends this section with a study of the English characters in the imaginative literature of the period.

The third section deals with French knowledge of English language, thought and literature. It is clearly shown that lack of knowledge of the language was responsible for imperfect contacts in the other respects. In the seventeenth century the French still did not trouble to learn English, and their knowledge of literary and scientific works was limited to such as were written in Latin, and to translations, more or less faithful, and, in the latter half of the century, to reviews and excerpts in periodic journals. Books of travel, history, classical philology, experimental science, medicine, philosophy, political theory, and ethics were most eagerly translated and read. English poetry was practically unknown, the novel scarcely less so, and the drama hastily and superficially judged by travellers in England for its bloodthirstiness, its obscenity, its contempt of the Aristotelian conventions, and its mingling of tragic and comic. Only Addison's *Cato* was judged worthy—with reservations—of translation into French. M. Ascoli examines many claims in favour of possible literary influence of English works on French and discounts them almost entirely. It was not till the time of Voltaire and Prévost that English literature began to be known and appreciated.

The second half of the second volume is devoted to an exhaustive and monumental bibliography which should be invaluable to all students of the period.

The proof-reading of these two closely printed volumes must have been a Herculean task, and it is not surprising that a number of misprints have escaped the author. Many of these are trifling, such as the printer's obstinate evasion of capital letters in the titles of English works, and his preference for French forms—e.g. p. vi, note 1, 'french,' 'english,' 'Restauration'; some are more serious, however, such as 1690 for 1590 as the date of Sidney's *Arcadia* (II, p. 132), Walter for Waller (II, p. 123), 1662 as the date of the Restoration (II, p. 167), and the absence of note 26 on page 263 of vol. I. It is confusing to find Defoe sometimes referred to as *De Foe* and sometimes as *Foe*.

There are one or two minor points on which I would challenge M. Ascoli. On his own showing Madame cannot be Monmouth's half-sister (I, p. 155), since she was the youngest daughter of Charles I and he a son of Charles II. It does not emerge clearly from M. Ascoli's account (I, p. 176) that Killiecrankie was a Jacobite victory. He calls in question (I, p. 307, note 81) La Motraye's statement that the watchmen 'annoncent à haute voix quel temps il fait, quelle heure il est, à chaque fois que l'heure sonne,' taking 'quel temps il fait' as a mis-translation of 'what time it is.' It is a matter of common knowledge in England that the watchman's call incorporated a brief weather report, e.g., 'Past two o'clock and a fine frosty morning.'

In support of the Englishman's attitude towards death (I, p. 435), M. Ascoli might have quoted La Fontaine, *Fables*, XII, 23:

le peu d'amour pour la vie
Leur nuit en mainte occasion,

and to note 15 on page 427 (vol. I) he might have added another reference to the same poem:

Les Anglais pensent profondément;
Leur esprit en cela suit leur tempérament.
Creusant dans les sujets, et forts d'expériences,
Ils étendent partout l'empire des sciences.

These, however, are minor errors, and trivial omissions. Nothing of real importance has escaped M. Ascoli's vigilance. His book is a mine of information in all that concerns Anglo-French intellectual relations during the seventeenth century. In spite of something ominously conclusive about the final pages, it is to be hoped that new activities will not prevent him from carrying forward the work so well begun into the still more fruitful field of the eighteenth century.

MYSIE E. I. ROBERTSON.

MANCHESTER.

Francis Vielé-Griffin. Son œuvre, sa pensée, son art. Par JEAN DE COURS.
Paris: H. Champion. 1930. xxv + 242 pp. 32 fr.

In 1922 the author of this book wrote an introduction to a selection of the poems of M. Vielé-Griffin, published by the *Mercur de France*. The

present work is prefaced by a friend who, lamenting the death of Jean de Cours, speaks of this study as his 'somme esthétique.' If we should be tempted to imply that the later work is an amplification, and sometimes a dilution, of the earlier, we assume that, under happier stars, it might have been brought to the point of conciseness and finish which makes the introduction so good an essay of its kind.

It is surprising that no monograph of adequate dimensions had been written before this on Francis Vielé-Griffin. A poet of fine integrity and of long achievement, he is the one surviving Symbolist whose record can be represented as a pure and harmonious curve. He shares with M. Paul Fort the reputation of having brought the *chanson* back into favour. With Ronsard he is the inspired lover of Touraine. And like Swinburne, whom he admires and has translated, he is an exultant singer of sea and earth. His chief claims to distinction, however, are two: his contribution to the initiation and defence of the *vers libre*, and the confirmed philosophy of joy and the beauty of living, which he has proclaimed in defiance of a decadent age. 'Sa poésie,' said Remy de Gourmont, 'reste simple, saine et joyeuse—quelque chose de nouveau dans la poésie française.'

The late Jean de Cours has said all this with the fervour of a disciple, having the master's cause insistently at heart. He has left a generous appreciation, which has good parts; but which is often more enthusiastic than discriminating. This reservation is made with reference to the first two or three sections of the work, not to the last. The discussion of the nature and history of free verse in France is a documented survey, offering a lucid introduction to the problems raised by the modern form. The treatment of Symbolism is less satisfactory, because the author tends to define that extensive and complex movement in terms of his hero's achievement alone. Mallarmé's ghost is exiled among the Parnassians, who rejected him in the flesh. The second part deals adequately with the poet's thought; the first, with his *œuvre*, from which abundant quotations are made.

A movement of admiration which makes M. Vielé-Griffin the equal of Bergson, Barrès and Gide, and superior to Whitman, might possibly find its counterpart in more hearts than one. But to refer to him as an epic poet and as a French dramatist, is to sacrifice sense of proportion to respect for genres, which seem never specifically to have preoccupied an author who called the finest of his dramatic poems simply an 'essai de psychologie.' M. Vielé-Griffin is essentially a lyric poet; he has been considered the most significant of the *verslibristes*. On this side J. de Cours's appreciations are just as well as generous. One may emulate him and admit that the epigraph he took from Renouvier is, on the whole, justified: 'Je ne dogmatise pas. Je cherche au contraire à comprendre.' The son of a general in the American army, M. Vielé-Griffin has, in his own field, been a valiant fighter. Students seeking an informed account, rather than a critical estimate, of his poetic campaigns, should find what they want in this book.

P. M. JONES.

A History of Spanish Literature. By ERNEST MÉRIMÉE. Translated, revised, and enlarged by S. GRISWOLD MORLEY. London: G. Routledge. 1931. xiv + 635 pp. 15s.

When the late Ernest Mérimée published his *Précis d'Histoire de la Littérature Espagnole* in 1908, an interested French scholar was able to fill forty pages of a review with its inaccuracies. Errors of detail still abounded in the third edition, 'entièrement refondue,' of 1922, that of 1918 being merely a reprint. But from the beginning there were other, very French, qualities that have made the book the *vade mecum* of countless English-speaking as well as French and Spanish students. One regrets that the significant word in the French title should have disappeared in the present version, for these qualities were precisely those of the *précis*; adequacy with concision, sobriety and impartiality ('un résumé n'est point une controverse, ni une profession de foi'), and always and above all clarity and order. Fitzmaurice-Kelly has his peculiar place in our affections, yet he can devote twelve pages in his *New History* to Calderón without mentioning *La Vida es Sueño*. To progress by Mérimée was to find that one could soon dispense with the index, so surely was everything in its place, and the respect due to 'trente longues années' of Spanish studies was one that deepened with familiarity.

Professor Morley has enjoyed access to an interleaved, annotated copy of the 1922 edition in which the author, and after him his son, had accumulated notes towards a new revision. His modesty, which keeps his name from the title-page, makes it difficult to know the exact measure of our indebtedness to him. He has 'rewritten and added with some freedom,' and he admits to three major contributions apart from living authors—the *romancero*, the brothers Valdés and the dramas of Galdós. Collation here, as indeed throughout, shows his guiding principle to have been a scrupulous fidelity towards his author, save when faced with serious omission or inaccuracy of fact. His material achievement is thus to be seen chiefly as the sum total of innumerable dates corrected, details added, bibliographical notes amplified, doubtful statements adroitly modified. It is with inaccuracy—or inadequacy—of interpretation that fidelity becomes irksome. Spanish literary history rewrites itself with disturbing rapidity, and Prof. Morley might well hesitate to subscribe to many views that were doctrine a decade ago. 'It is needless to say that he (Professor Morley) has never ventured to alter an expressed judgment of M. Mérimée; in the rare cases where he did not agree, a note in brackets records the fact' (p. vi). He has, to be exact, altered one, for the Cid as *condottiere* has followed Dozy's fall from grace (p. 35). But Cervantes, who with Góngora stands out as the touchstone of recent research on the Golden Age, must remain in the text as 'in matters of religion, politics and morals. . . not at all superior to his contemporaries' (p. 309), with the consequent restricted appreciation of the *Don Quixote*—an appreciation, notwithstanding, much less jejune than Fitzmaurice-Kelly's—while Sr. Castro's *El Pensamiento de Cervantes* goes into a note in brackets. And Góngora's 'two distinct periods' (p. 228), hinging on the turn of the century, are ill at ease in the text, quite apart from recent criticism, when

it has to be admitted in a note that his *romance* quoted to illustrate Gongorism at its height is dated 1580.

The new Mérimée, in achieving the most rigorous modernity, has therefore lost something of the organic unity of the old. In face of the regretted deaths of the father and son who alone could have preserved that unity, Professor Morley has given us a most admirable second best. His translation is almost always entirely pleasing, though there is a suavity in the French 'nous' not to be had with our assertive 'I,' and 'In spite of every effort, the uninitiated simply cannot understand' (p. 232) reads very differently in the context from 'Malgré tout, le public non initié s'obstine à ne pas comprendre.' Seven illustrations and a valuable General Bibliography are new to the English version.

WILLIAM ATKINSON.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Herder-Bildnisse. Von JOSEF NADLER. (*Bilderhefte des Deutschen Ostens*, VIII.) Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzer. 1930. 4 pp. and 8 pl. 1 M. 50.

Johann Gottfried Herder, seine Vorfahren und seine Nachkommen. Von PETER VON GEBHARDT und HANS SCHAUER. Leipzig: Zentralstelle für Deutsche Personen- und Familiengeschichte. 1930. 2 vols. in 1. vi + 188 pp. and 63 Plates; viii + 363 pp. and 10 Plates. 39 M.

The range of subjects covered by the *Bilderhefte des Deutschen Ostens* is a very wide one, as the purpose is to attempt, by means of a series of carefully chosen representative pictures, to do justice to all sides of East Prussian life and civilisation, to illustrate, as we are told, 'was alles es im Deutschen Osten gibt, was alles aus unserem Osten kam.' No number could be more appropriate than one dealing with Herder, and with Professor Nadler as its editor, it acquires an added significance. In his brief introductory remarks Professor Nadler, after emphasising the embodiment of the 'Königsberger Geist' in Herder and his representation of it in Weimar, gives a few short, useful notes on the paintings themselves and their creators. To make a good selection of portraits of Herder is no easy task, for his features presented notorious difficulties to painters, and no one succeeded in producing an absolutely satisfactory picture. However, the choice—there are eight plates, including the well-known works by Anton Graff and Kugelgen—has been very happily made, not from the artistic standpoint alone, but with a view to giving an adequate representation of Herder at various stages of his life, and is very valuable in helping us to realise his sensitive, unharmonious, visionary nature. The reproduction of the pictures has been no less creditably executed.

One would hardly have been surprised to find Professor Nadler's name associated in some way with the second book under review, for genealogical studies are a declared necessity for the ethnological and anthropological method of literary interpretation. However, this book has not been prepared primarily with any definite academic purpose, but is due to the inspiration of Frau von Below, geb. von Herder, whose first intention was to produce an adequate account of the Herder family for the narrower circle of its members.

The results of investigations into the origin of the Herder family, undertaken as part of the preliminary work for this book, were published in 1922 by Dr Wilhelm Meyer of Königsberg, who proved that Herder's own assertion that he was of immediate Silesian extraction was without foundation, and that his family had been resident in Mohrungen for several generations at least. These results have now been incorporated by Dr von Gebhardt and completed by chapters on the Flachslund family and on Herder's descendants. Much in the later chapters will appeal doubtless only to students of heredity and genealogy, outside the immediate family circle. The 63 plates in vol. I include the most complete collection available of portraits of Herder and Caroline.

The two chapters on Johann Gottfried and Caroline Herder are a delight to all students of Herder. Dr Schauer, who contributes them, has discharged a none too easy, but, we are made to feel, very fascinating task with great distinction and charm. In the short space of some thirty pages, devoted to Johann Gottfried's career and personality, he gives us a masterpiece of clear and concise writing which remains to the end convincing and stimulating. The possible danger of idealisation has been carefully avoided: there emerges a well-balanced and sympathetic analysis of every side of Herder's complex personality—a detailed critical account of his works is neither attempted nor desired in a book of this nature—in which Dr Schauer, who is without doubt unrivalled at the present time in his intimacy with the details of Herder's life and the intricacies of his mentality, fulfils all our high expectations. He brings us to realise very clearly the unusually great importance of outward circumstances for the development of the peculiar features of his character. Dr von Gebhardt adds a section on Herder and Freemasonry.

No less successful is Dr Schauer's study of Caroline. For the first time we are given a connected account of the tender, sentimental, impulsive nature of Herder's 'Elsassermädgen,' and nowhere has the immense importance of her personal influence on Herder himself been investigated with so much penetration, or set out so clearly. Her self-sacrifice, her unquestioning loyalty, which with her passionate enthusiasm and blind impetuosity ('Elektra' Goethe not unfittingly called her) occasionally brought unpleasant consequences for her husband, her direction of the business side of his affairs, in which the encouragement she gave him to finish uncompleted works, especially the more remunerative ones, was not the least important feature, her quiet anticipation of his needs, and above all the subtle effects of her companionship, all this is sometimes left without sufficient emphasis in estimates of Herder. Dr Schauer had already given us a foretaste of this in the introduction to his edition of the correspondence between Herder and Caroline. For its completeness and the sureness of its judgments this account will recommend itself very strongly to Herder students.

Vol. II consists of a large collection of letters, almost all hitherto unpublished, in the possession of the family, supplemented occasionally from other sources. The very sound tradition, which, since Düntzer's inauspicious start, has been gradually built up in the matter of Herder

letters, in keeping with the standard of the Suphan edition of the works, has been ably continued and developed by Dr Schauer in his editions of *Herders Briefwechsel mit Caroline Flachsland* (1926-8) and *Herders Dresdener Reise* (1929), to which the present volume is a very worthy successor. The many letters of Caroline, mainly addressed to her son August, which form the greater part of this collection, as well as the new ones of Herder himself, throw a very valuable light especially on the somewhat neglected later years of Herder's life. The advice he gives to his son August illustrates his own predilections and antipathies, and is accompanied by reflections too on the course of his own youth. We are enabled to watch the progress of the publication of the first complete edition of his works—Caroline's chief care—which began to appear in 1805, as well as to judge of her devotion to his memory in other ways, for instance in her negotiations regarding Kugelgen's portrait, while at the same time obtaining interesting, if, coming from Caroline, biassed, comments on political and social affairs in Weimar. The letters have been given completely, and the notes are adequate and concise.

The authors have succeeded in producing a work that does much more than fulfil its original purpose as a family book: it is in many ways a valuable contribution to Herder scholarship as well.

A. GILLIES.

MANCHESTER.

Wilhelm Meister and his English Kinsmen. By SUSANNA HOWE. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Milford. 1930. x+331 pp. 15s. net.

Miss Howe studies the 'apprenticeship' theme in English literature from its source in some German novels of the late eighteenth century, and *Wilhelm Meister* in particular, to the present day. She points out the relationship of the young man who is shown passing through successive stages in life to the heroes of the moral allegory and the picaresque novel, and touches upon the shadowy links of ancestry that connect him with the medieval *Parzifal*. The influence of Goethe on the English novel is admittedly vague, and impossible to distinguish from the inspiration drawn from the common stock of ideas, but Miss Howe asserts that the theme of the *Bildungsroman* came to England chiefly through the medium of *Wilhelm Meister*, even though the apprenticeship novel never assumed the importance of a group classification or a type. Her thesis is therefore confined to tracing the passage of a set of literary ideas from Germany to England at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Beginning with the early critics and Romanticists she traces the working of these ideas, mainly through the writings of Carlyle, Bulwer and Disraeli, to the present age of novelists like Meredith, Bennett, Wells, Maugham and Walpole.

Even though the scope of this study has been further limited by the omission of novels, such as those of Dickens and Thackeray, whose heroes 'have not developed through any inner realisation of their own powers and the resolve to make their experience function,' the terms of

reference are still somewhat wide. The conclusions might have been more fruitful if the limitation had been even narrower. Much of the material appears to be not altogether relevant to the theme and, in the case of all the novelists except Carlyle and Bulwer, the parallels with *Wilhelm Meister* would be more readily accepted if it could be proved that they did not derive from the ideas common to the author's generation or, alternatively, that those common ideas derived from Goethe. The first half of Miss Howe's book provides useful material in connexion with the problem of Goethe's influence in England, but it would have gained in value from a more ruthless rejection of dubious evidence.

WILLIAM ROSE.

LONDON.

Strindberg's Dramatic Expressionism. By C. E. W. L. DAHLSTRÖM. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. 1930. xii + 242 pp. \$2.50.

This volume falls into two parts, the first of which is devoted to a study of the critical literature that deals with the Expressionist movement in Germany. In the second part the author investigates Strindberg's dramas with a view to determining the nature of his dramatic 'Expressionism' and the extent to which it contains the factors established in the first part. The analysis of Strindberg's plays and the conclusions consequent upon that analysis will be of considerable value to the student of the Expressionist movement, of which the Swedish dramatist was one of the chief sources of inspiration. The investigation might have been approached from the opposite angle; that is to say, the analysis of Strindberg's dramas might have been undertaken first, and the resultant conclusions used to examine the extent to which the German Expressionist writers drew their inspiration from their predecessor. The author, however, has preferred to establish 'norms' by a preliminary examination of the utterances of a number of theorists and critics. He has attempted a synthesis of their views and has applied the 'norms' thus acquired to an analysis not only of Strindberg's productions but also of those of the German movement. We can have no quarrel with his method, though it is a dangerous one, for it accords too much importance to theory. It is true that much of the theory on which Dr Dahlström draws appeared when the Expressionist movement was at its height or in decline, and that this mass of theory was therefore to a large extent based on actual practice, but our criticism is not thereby invalidated. Dr Dahlström recognises, as he says, that practice was not wholly an outgrowth of theory, even when in accord with it, but the method by which he infers what he calls his 'norms' lends a somewhat unreal air to his conclusions when he applies those 'norms' to actual practice.

The material collected in the first part of the volume is considerable. The views of critics on Expressionism in painting and literature are related in detail, the history of the term and the movement is discussed, and the intellectual and social background touched upon. Six 'control factors' are eventually established and labelled *Ausstrahlungen des Ichs*,

the Unconscious, *Seele*, Music, Religion, and the Worth of Man respectively, but it seems to us that these are obvious aspects of Expressionist literature, deducible from a reading of the actual works, and that the attempt to set up a four-square system, based on a synthetic study of theoretical and critical writings, may lead to conclusions that are misleading. Dr Dahlström's summaries of Expressionist theory and criticism are useful and welcome, but the whole section is more remarkable for the patience with which the literature *about* Expressionism has been ploughed through than for insight into the living motives which brought the movement into being. There is a voluminous bibliography, and the list of periodical articles on Expressionism will, in particular, be extremely valuable.

A final statement of the author touches upon a problem which has recently been examined by a number of German literary historians—the 'generation' problem. He points out that this type of drama was produced by very young men, and agrees with the critic Julius Bab that 'the world might experience some difficulty in flowing through the egos of these *Knaben*-dramatists: childishness and dilettantism are quite natural effects.' But were the Expressionists so very young? They were all of the generation that fought in the War, and if we take 1916 as the year in which the Expressionist movement began to move towards its climax, Kaiser was then 38 years of age, Sternheim 37, von Unruh 31, Kornfeld 27, Hasenclever and Werfel 26, Sorge 25, Toller 23, and Bronnen 21. It is obvious that these cannot be grouped together simply as 'Knaben.' Sorge wrote *Der Bettler* at the age of 19, and Kaiser was 40 when the first part of *Gas* appeared. Both dramas are outstanding examples of Expressionist technique, but we can hardly assign the authors to the same generation. The generation problem is an important one, and the spade work on the subject now being done in Germany should provide the foundation for fruitful investigation in the future.

WILLIAM ROSE.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

The tenth volume of *The Year's Work in English Studies* (London: H. Milford. 1931. 418 pp. 10s. 6d.) covers the year 1929. It has been edited by Dr F. S. Boas, who has nobly shouldered the whole burden which he shared in former years with Professor Herford and, before him, with Sir Sidney Lee. Dr Boas, a contributor to the first volume, thenceforward joint-editor of this publication, and now sole editor, has supervised this task of surveying English scholarship with such adequacy as could be rendered possible only by his own competence and devotion together with the skilled labours of a remarkable group of collaborators of exceptional authority in the various fields of study. The withdrawal of Professor Herford, whose death we now lament, has brought in his place Professor

Elton to deal with Literary History and Criticism, the only change among the contributors to the ninth volume. The year 1929 produced no single work of outstanding importance, but this survey records a steady output of valuable research, criticism and material for study. The books of the year which have attracted most attention are perhaps Dr Greg's second volume of *Literary Autographs*, Professor C. R. Baskervill's *Elizabethan Jig* and Professor Pottle's *Literary Career of James Boswell*. It is strange to find but one reference to Tennyson, recording only a reprint of a *Life* published in 1923. I do not know why the spelling *Blagrove* is adopted for Thomas Blagrove (pp. 191-2). *Dekinger* should read *Denkinger* (p. 123), and I am not aware that Professor Cazamian has received the honour of knighthood (Index, p. 402).

C. J. S.

The Metres of English Poetry, by Enid Hamer (London: Methuen. 1930. ix + 340 pp. 10s. 6d.), is a readable study of English prosody on traditional lines. The author advances no new theory or system; the novelty of her analysis lies rather in the relationship which it establishes between metre and poetic significance, in the examination of rhythms 'principally as the strings of a delicate instrument for the creation of poetic effects.' A summary recount of 'The Principles of English Metre' is followed by a survey of verse and strophic forms upon an historical basis. By far the most valuable section is that devoted to blank verse, where the writer has succeeded in establishing important distinctions between the dramatic and non-dramatic kinds as well as between the practice of poets at different periods. In a work of this sort omissions are inevitable; it is, nevertheless, unfortunate that in so penetrating and methodical a study a section on the Horatian ode should contain no reference to Milton's *Ode to Pyrrha*, the most perfect specimen of this form in English and undoubtedly the model for Collins's *Ode to Evening*, which is duly quoted. A more serious defect is the writer's failure to recognise the contribution of the old alliterative line and its survival, through the alliterative verse of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in the 'tumbling measure' of the sixteenth, represented in *Flodden Field* and Tusser's *Good Husbandrie*. In the comments upon Burns some attention should have been devoted to the influence of earlier Scottish vernacular verse.

The effectiveness of Miss Hamer's criticism leaves a feeling of regret that she should have so rigidly confined herself within conventional restrictions. The analysis of a paragraph from *Paradise Lost* (p. 97), so far as it goes, is unexceptionable; but can it seriously be contended that the verse is governed mainly by the elements under consideration—foot-structure and pause? Similarly, one feels that system rather than critic is responsible for the astonishing statements that, in Marlowe's 'Our soules, whose faculties can comprehend' etc., 'humdrum rhythm depreciates great splendour of diction,' and that 'the prosody of *Paradise Regained* is similar to that of *Paradise Lost*, except in one or two details.' Miss Hamer takes us just as far as an outworn conveyance will allow, and no further.

B. E. C. D.

Professor John Livingston Lowes' inaugural Gollancz Memorial Lecture on Chaucer (*The Art of Geoffrey Chaucer*. London: H. Milford. 1931. 32 pp. 2s.) is in every way worthy of the occasion, of its subject, and of its author, who continues admirably the great Harvard tradition of Chaucerian scholarship. In this lecture we find once more the illuminating process of interpretation which depends on intimate knowledge of a poet's reading, applied to Chaucer as it was applied in detail to Coleridge in *The Road to Xanadu*. What Professor Lowes attributes to his author he has himself: 'a powerfully associative memory, which played, as he read, over the multitude of impressions from previous reading, with which his mind was stored' (p. 19). A sounder or more stimulating preface to Chaucer could hardly be written. Some glaring misprints should surely have been avoided when the Oxford University Press prints for the British Academy, e.g., *omnivorous* for *omnivorous* (p. 4), *swan* for *swam* (p. 13), or *ragionamente* for *ragionamenti* (p. 24). C. J. S.

A Shakespeare Bibliography, by Walter Ebisch and Levin L. Schücking (Oxford: University Press. 1931. 294 pp. 21s.), is a book to praise, not to review. It is indeed hardly a book, so much as a compendious catalogue of books in many tongues dealing with all conceivable aspects of Shakespearean scholarship. Commendation of its authors must begin with a recognition of their heroic courage in undertaking so vast an enterprise. But naturally, the *Modern Language Review* is more concerned with their academic than with their moral qualities. They have not only had to compile a vast list; they have had to select their items from a well-nigh inexhaustible stock; and they have had to devise a scheme of classification to give to their list readiness and simplicity in use. In this lies their greatest merit. They have set out all that belongs to Shakespearean scholarship in divisions and subdivisions which explain and justify themselves. And their full table of contents, indicating the sequence and relation of their divisions, greatly facilitates the use of the book for reference. It is difficult to see how the plan of the volume could be improved in any way; and if any part of it is of less use than the rest, it is the twenty odd pages listing books on Elizabethan as distinct from Shakespearean, literature. An entry on the fly-leaf appears to indicate that some share in the publication has been taken by the Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig; and we would express to them as well as to the Oxford Press our thanks for international co-operation in a book which is not only international in its contents, but which indicates the worth of Shakespeare's name in the fostering of those ideal interests which are common to all nations. H. B. C.

Professor Henry W. Farnam, a professional economist, has constructed from Shakespeare's plays a picture of the economic life of his time (*Shakespeare's Economics*. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xv + 187 pp. 11s. 6d.), grouping the material under such heads as, The Sea and Its Ventures, The Land and Its Foison, Exchange and Its Instruments, Labor and Its Status, Social Economics.

He runs rapidly through a series of quotations stopping here and there, however, to emphasise some point in Shakespeare's economic knowledge or outlook. Taken individually most of his items are familiar knowledge or at least to be found in the commentators, but it is pleasant to have the information gathered together and arranged in a coherent form. It is a pity Professor Farnam did not allow himself more scope in his discussion of Shakespeare's Social Economics. He should have mentioned Shakespeare's share in the play of *Sir Thomas More* and entered Professor R. W. Chambers's contribution to Vol. II of *Shakespeare Problems* (Cambridge University Press) in his Notes. If he prints a second edition he should add Professor Chambers's further contribution in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxvi, p. 252 ff. P. A.

Elizabethan scholarship cannot be too grateful to the Huntington Library for its series of facsimiles of unique books in its possession. After *The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts*, 1648, in type-facsimile, we now have two collotype facsimiles (*Shakespeare's Hamlet, The First Quarto*, 1603; *Plutarch's Quyetie of Mynde, Translated by Thomas Wyat*; Huntington Library Publications. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; H. Milford: Oxford University Press. 1931. 17s. and 10s. 6d. respectively). There can be no question of the advantage of collotype reproduction as compared with other processes, except as a rule on the ground of cost. Even this difficulty has been very reasonably met in these publications at a moderate price which puts valuable material within the reach of students. The *Hamlet*, for example, which reproduces the famous Devonshire copy, serves to control the imperfections of the Furnivall-Griggs lithographic facsimile, which fails to indicate several instances of wrong fount, broken type, or irregular aligning, and in one instance, at least, omits a letter (*his* for *this*, sig. B 1^v). The significance of Wyat's translation of Plutarch's essay is made clear in the admirable introduction by Professor C. R. Baskervill prefaced to the text. And it is good to have at our disposal an excellent reproduction of a book of Pynson's printing. I find in this instance a certain lack of uniformity in the tone of the reproduction which is perhaps not all due to the inking of the original.

C. J. S.

Mr Tatsu Sasaki's monograph *On the Language of Robert Bridges' Poetry* (Tokyo: Kenkyusha. 1931. x+106 pp.) is an interesting and commendable attempt to deduce a poet's mode of thinking—his mental attitude towards external and internal phenomena—from his mode of expressing his impressions in words; or, to put this differently, to discover what inner logic and psychology determine the grammatical features of the poet's language. Mr Sasaki has carefully collected his evidence and painstakingly sifted and examined it. He comes to the conclusion that Bridges' mode of thought tended to the verbal and predicative mode of expression; he suggests that the cause for this mental predilection was due to 'his reflective genius, which was the reverse to the intuitive, and to his classical method of treatment, which is opposed to anything in the way

of ecstasy.' But to assume, as he does, that noun + adjective possesses 'the full value of subject and predicate' and that such a combination is 'tantamount to a piece of predication'—and from these assumptions to reason that the poet's thought tends towards the predicative mode of expression without comparing the poet's usage of these noun + adjective constructions with his usage of the adjective + noun combination is to put forward the case for the plaintiff without considering that of the defendant. One can prove anything by treating evidence in the manner that it has here been treated. It is not the actual frequency of noun + adjective occurrences which should provide evidence for the poet's mode of thinking, but the preponderance of noun + adjective over adjective + noun occurrences (or over other alternative forms).

Most of this brief investigation is on thoroughly sound lines; the poet's mode of thought is of prime interest to all. Results such as are to be found on p. 87 are certainly most useful; but if deduction and comparisons are to be made, a complete examination of the syntactical combinations selected for study must be carried out.

P. G.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

September—November, 1931

GENERAL.

- CHOTZEN, T. M., *Primitieve Keltistiek in de Nederlanden*. 's Gravenhage, M. Nijhoff. 1 fl. 20.
- DUBOCH, L., *Histoire générale illustrée du théâtre*. I. Paris, Libr. de France. 525 fr.
- Essays by *Divers Hands*: Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. x. Ed. by Sir F. Younghusband. London, H. Milford. 7s.
- Huntington Library Bulletin, The. I. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- HUSE, H. R., *The Psychology of Foreign Language Study*. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press; London, H. Milford. \$3.
- KIECKERS, E., *Die Sprachstämme der Erde (Kultur und Sprache, vii)*. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 4 M. 50.
- LEWIS, B. R., *Creative Poetry: a Study of its Creative Principles*. Stanford Univ. Press, Cal.; London, H. Milford. 23s.
- MAHRHOLZ, W., *Literaturgeschichte und Literaturwissenschaft*. Leipzig, Kröner. 3 M.
- THOMAS, P. G., *Aspects of Literary Theory and Practice, 1550-1870*. London, Heath Cranton. 7s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- MEYER-LÜBKE, W., *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3. Aufl. Lief. 5, 6. Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 2 M. 50.

Mediaeval Latin.

- Studien zur lateinischen Dichtung des Mittelalters*. Ehrengabe für K. Strecker. Herausg. von W. Stach und H. Walther. Dresden, Von Baensch. 15 M.

Italian.

- AMBROSINI, L., *Cronache del Risorgimento e Scritti letterari*. Milan, La Cultura. L. 25.
- BACCHELLI, R., *La congiura di Don Giulio d'Este*. Milan, Treves. L. 30.
- BRISSET, F., *Laure de Pétrarque*. Paris, Perrin. 12 fr.
- CARDUCCI, G., *Lettere a G. Chiarini*. A cura di L. Chiarini. Milan, Bestetti e Tumminelli. L. 12.
- CERINI, M., *Michelangelo Buonarroti e i Lirici minori del Cinquecento*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.25.
- CEVELOTO, M., *Carlo Goldoni avvocato veneto*. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 10.
- Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*. Herausg. von F. Schneider. XIII. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 14 M.
- GARDNER, E. G., *Virgil in Italian Poetry (Annual Italian Lecture, British Academy)*. London, H. Milford. 1s. 6d.
- LORD, L. E., *A Translation of the Orpheus of Politian and the Aminta of Tasso*. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- NARDELLI, F., and A. LIVINGSTON. G. D'Annunzio. London, J. Cape. 12s. 6d.

- NAVIGATIO SANCTI BRENDANI, an Old Italian Version. Ed. by E. G. R. Waters. (Publ. of the Philological Society, x.) London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- NIEVO, I., *Le confessioni di un Italiano*. Prima edizione critica. A cura di F. Palazzi. Milan, Treves. L. 250.
- STUDI DANTESCHI diretti da M. Barbi. xvi. Florence, Sansoni.
- VICO, G. B., *La scienza nuova prima*. A cura di F. Nicolini. (Scrittori d'Italia.) Bari, Laterza. L. 30.
- ZINGARELLI, N., *La vita, i tempi e le opere di Dante*. 2 vols. (Storia letteraria d'Italia.) Milan, Vallardi. L. 110.

Spanish, Portuguese.

- BACH Y RITA, P., *The Works of Pere Torroella, a Catalanian Writer of the 15th Century*. New York, Instituto de las Españas.
- DUNN, J., *A Grammar of the Portuguese Language*. London, D. Nutt. 9s.
- FORD, J. D. M., A. F. WHITTEN and M. I. RAPHAEL, *A Tentative Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Brazil*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- FORD, J. D. M., and R. LANSING, *Cervantes. A Tentative Bibliography of his Works and of the Biographical and Critical Material concerning him*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s.
- GÓNGORA, L. DE, *The Solitudes*, transl. by E. M. Wilson. Cambridge, W. Heffer. 5s.
- MONTGOMERY, C. M., *Early Costumbrista Writers in Spain, 1750-1830*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- RIVERA, G., *A Tentative Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Porto Rico*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 4s.
- WAXMAN, S. M., *A Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Santo Domingo*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 4s.

French.

(a) General (including Linguistic).

- CRAMER, F., *Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von 'Jean' im Französischen* (Giessener Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie, xxiii). Giessen, Romanisches Seminar. 4 M.
- FOUCHÉ, P., *Le verbe français. Étude morphologique*. (Publ. de l'Université de Strasbourg, lvi.) Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 50 fr.
- GOTTSCALK, W., *Französische Schülersprache* (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, iv, 3). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.

(b) Old French.

- SZOGS, S., *Aspremont. Entwicklungsgeschichte und Stellung innerhalb der Karlsgerste*. (Romanistische Arbeiten, xviii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 7 M.
- VORETZSCH, K., *Introduction to the Study of Old French Literature*. Transl. by F. M. Du Mont. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 16 M.

(c) Modern French.

- BILLARD, CLAUDE, *Gaston de Foix, tragédie*. Republ. by E. H. Polinger. New York, Inst. of French Studies. \$1.
- CATHERINE THE GREAT, *Documents of. The Correspondence with Voltaire and the 'Instruction of 1767' in the English Text of 1768*. Ed. by W. F. Reddaway. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.
- CLAPTON, G. T., *Baudelaire et De Quincey*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

- DABNEY, L. E., Claude Billard: Minor French Dramatist of the early Seventeenth Century (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literature and Languages, xix). Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. \$1.25.
- DECHAMPS, J., Sur la légende de Napoléon (Bibliothèque de la Revue de litt. comparée, lxxiii). Paris, H. Champion. 40 fr.
- FAGUET, É., Histoire de la poésie française. v. N. Boileau. Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.
- GRANNIS, V. B., Dramatic Parody in 18th Century France. New York, Institute of French Studies. \$2.75.
- MARCH, H., F. Soulié, Novelist and Dramatist of the Romantic Period. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 16s.
- MERIAN-GENAST, E., H. F. Amiel im Spiegel der europäischen Kritik, 1881-1931 (Die neueren Sprachen, Beiheft xxi). Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 6 M.
- SEILER, M. H., Anne de Marquets, poétesse religieuse du XVIIe siècle. Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America.
- TRAHAD, P., Les maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIIIe siècle. I. Paris, Boivin. 30 fr.
- VERLAINE, P., Oeuvres complètes. 8 vols. Paris, Libr. de France. 500 fr.
- WILSON, R. MCNAIR, Germaine de Staël. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode. 15s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- HEMPEL, H., Atlamál und germanischer Stil (Germanistische Abhandlungen, lxiv). Breslau, M. Marcus. 8 M. 40.
- HIRT, H., Handbuch des Urgermanischen. I. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, I, i, 21, 1. Lief.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M.
- JOSTES, F., Sonnenwende. Forschungen zur germanischen Religions- und Sagen-geschichte. Münster, Aschendorff. 26 M. 40.
- TAYLOR, A., Edward and Sven i Rosengård. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 11s. 6d.

Scandinavian.

- AAKJÆR, J., Samlede Digte. Mindeudgave. II. Copenhagen, Levin og Munksgaard. 6 kr.
- BERENDSOHN, W. A., S. Lagerlöf: her Life and Work. Adapted from the German by G. F. Timpson. London, Nicholson and Watson. 7s. 6d.
- FOGELQVIST, T., E. A. Karlfeldt. En minnesteckning. Stockholm, Norstedt. 3 kr.
- GRAS, E. J., De nordse Loki-Mythen in hun onderling verband. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willing. 2 fl.
- JACOBSEN, L., Eggjum-Stenen. Forsøg paa en filologisk Tolkning. Copenhagen, Levin og Munksgaard. 20 kr.
- KNUDSEN, T., og A. SOMMERVELT, Norsk Riksmåls-Ordbok. Hefte 4. Oslo, H. Aschehoug. 1 kr.
- KOCK, E. A., und R. MEISSNER, Skaldisches Lesebuch. 2 Teile. (Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher, xvii, xviii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer.
- PHILLPOTTS, B. S., Edda and Saga (Home University Library). London, T. Butterworth. 2s. 6d.
- RUBOW, P. V., Georg Brandes og den kritiske Tradition. Copenhagen, Levin og Munksgaard. 6 kr.
- STRINDBERG, A., Master Olof and other Plays. Translated by C. D. Locock and J. Bulman. Introduction by J. G. Robertson. London, J. Cape. 7s. 6d.

English.*(a) General (including Linguistic).*

- BROPHY, J., and E. PARTRIDGE, Songs and Slang of the British Soldier, 1914–1918. An Anthology and a Glossary. London, Scholartis Press. 10s. 6d.
- CURME, G. O., and H. KURATH, A Grammar of the English Language. III. Syntax. Boston, D. C. Heath. 12s. 6d.
- GRANT, W., The Scottish National Dictionary. I, 1. Edinburgh, Scottish Nat. Dictionary Assoc. 21s.
- GROSE, F., A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue. London, Scholartis Press. 32s.
- Royster Memorial Studies (Studies in Philology, xxviii, 4). Ed. by L. B. Wright, D. MacMillan, N. B. Adams, R. Adams, and G. A. Harrer. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press. \$4.00.
- SJOESTEDT, M. L., Phonétique d'un Parler irlandais de Kerry (Collection de Documents Linguistiques, iv). Paris, E. Leroux. 80 fr.
- STERN, G., Meaning and Change of Meaning with special reference to the English Language (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, xxxviii, 1). Göteborg, Elander. 15 kr.

(b) Old and Middle English.

- ANDREW, S. O., The Old English Alliterative Measure. London, H. R. Grubb. 5s.
- CHAMBERS, R. W., and M. DAUNT, Book of London English, 1384–1425. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.
- CHIRVAN, R., Angelsaksisch Handboek. In het nederlandsch bewerkt door E. L. Deuschle. (Oudgermaansche Handboeken, iv.) Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink.
- HABER, T. B., A Comparative Study of the Beowulf and the Aeneid. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18s.
- HALL, J. R. CLARK, A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. 3rd ed. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 30s.
- KETRICK, P. J., The Relation of Golagros and Gavane to the Old French Perceval. Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America.
- KLAEBER, F., The Later Genesis and other Old English and Old Saxon Texts relating to the Fall of Man. New ed. (Englische Textbibliothek, xv.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.
- PLESSOW, G., Gotische Tektonik im Wortkunstwerk. Künstlerisches im Bau der mittelenenglischen Romanze von Gawain und dem grünen Ritter. Munich, M. Hüber. 15 M.
- SOUTH, H. P., The Proverbs of Alfred, studied in the light of the recently discovered Maidstone MS. New York, Univ. of New York Press.
- SZOGS, A., Die Ausdrücke für 'Arbeit' und 'Beruf' im Altenglischen (Anglistische Forschungen, lxxiii). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 7 M.

(c) Modern English.

- AGAR, H., Milton and Plato (Princeton Studies in English, ii). Princeton, N.J., Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- ALBERTS-ARNDT, B., Die englische Gesellschaft im Spiegel der Romane von G. Meredith. Karlsruhe, G. Braun. 4 M. 80.
- BABCOCK, R. W., The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry, 1766–1799. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press; London, H. Milford. 13s. 6d.
- BAILEY, J., Introductions to Jane Austen. London, H. Milford. 6s.

- BALDWIN, T. W., *W. Shakespeare adapts a Hanging*. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 16s.
- BERNBAUM, E., *Guide through the Romantic Movement (Guide and Anthology of Romanticism, i)*. New York, T. Nelson.
- BLANKENSHIP, R., *American Literature*. London, G. Routledge. 15s.
- BOILEAU, H. T., *Italy in the Post-Victorian Novel*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- BOUCHER, H., *La Jeunesse de Browning et le poème de Sordello*. Geneva, Jent.
- BROWNE, SIR THOMAS, *Works*, v, vi. Ed. by G. Keynes. London, Faber and Faber. Set of 6 vols., 84s.
- BUCHAN, J., *The Novel and the Fairy Tale (English Association Pamphlets, 79)*. 2s.
- BURNS, R., *Letters*. Ed. from the Original manuscripts, by J. De Lancey Ferguson. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 30s.
- BUTLER, P., *Materials for the Life of Shakespeare*. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press. 9s.
- CLARK, C., *A Study of Shakespeare's Henry VIII*. London, Golden Vista Press. 6s.
- CLARK, C., *Shakespeare and the Supernatural*. London, Williams and Norgate. 12s. 6d.
- COLEMAN, E. D., *The Bible in English Drama*. New York, Public Library. \$1.
- COWPER, W., *Poems*. Ed. by H. F. Anson Fausset. (Everyman Library, 872.) London, Dent. 2s.
- CRUM, R. B., *Scientific Thought in Poetry*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 15s.
- DARBISHIRE, H., *The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost, Book i*. London, H. Milford. 30s.
- DARK, R., *Shakespeare—and that Crush*. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 4s. 6d.
- FARNAM, H. W., *Shakespeare's Economics*. New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s. 6d.
- FIOR, R. A., *Folkways in Thomas Hardy*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press; London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- FIRTH, C. H., *Sir Sidney Lee, 1859-1926 (British Academy Proceedings, xv)*. London, H. Milford. 1s.
- FISCHER, W., *Die englische Literatur der Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika*. Wildpark-Potsdam, Athenaeon. 10 M. 80.
- GRAY, C. H., *Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 20s.
- GREEN, A. W., *The Inns of Court and Early English Drama*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s. 6d.
- GREG, W. W., *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 84s.
- HALPERIN, M., *Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans la littérature anglo-américaine au XIXe et au XXe siècles*. Paris, Jouve.
- HOTSON, L., *Shakespeare versus Shallow*. London, Nonesuch Press. 12s. 6d.
- KELLETT, E. E., *Fashion in Literature: a Study of Changing Taste*. London, G. Routledge. 12s. 6d.
- KELLNER, L., *Erläuterungen und Textverbesserungen zu vierzehn Dramen Shakespeares*. Aus dem Nachlass herausg. von W. Ebisch. (Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig, Anglistische Abt., iv.) Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 18 M.
- KEYNES, G., *Bibliography of William Hazlitt*. London, Nonesuch Press. 16s.

- KNIGHT, G. W., *The Imperial Theme. Further Interpretations of Shakespeare's Tragedies, including the Roman Plays.* London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- LINDABURY, R. V., *A Study of Patriotism in the Elizabethan Drama.* Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9s.
- LONGAKER, M., *English Biography in the Eighteenth Century.* Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press; London, H. Milford. 21s.
- LOWES, J. L., *The Art of Geoffrey Chaucer (British Academy).* London, H. Milford. 2s.
- MARLOWE, C., *Poems*, ed. by L. C. Martin. London, Methuen.
- MEYERS, A. M., *Representation and Misrepresentation of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama.* Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- Minor Poets of the Seventeenth Century.* Ed. by R. G. Howarth. (Everyman Library, 873.) London, Dent. 2s.
- Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border.* Ed. by T. Henderson. London, G. G. Harrap. 10s. 6d.
- MURRAY, R. H., *Edmund Burke: a Biography.* London, H. Milford. 15s.
- Pepys Ballads, The.* Ed. by H. E. Rollins. vi. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 16s.
- Poetical Rhapsody, A, 1602-21.* Ed. by H. E. Rollins. i. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18s. 6d.
- RICHARDSON, L. N., *A History of Early American Magazines.* New York, Nelson. \$5.
- ROSENBLATT, L., *L'Idee de l'art pour l'art dans la littérature anglaise pendant la période victorienne (Bibliothèque de la revue de littérature comparée, lxx).* Paris, H. Champion.
- SAINTSBURY, G., *A Consideration of Thackeray.* London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- SANDFORD, W. P. L., *English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828.* Printed typescript. Columbus, Ohio State Univ.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Henry V; King Lear.* Facsimiles of the First Folio Texts. Ed. by J. Dover Wilson. London, Faber and Faber. Each 6s.
- SITWELL, E., *Alexander Pope.* London, Faber and Faber. 7s. 6d.
- THOMAS, E. W., *Christina Rossetti (Columbia Univ. Studies in English and Comparative Literature).* New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 15s.
- THORNDIKE, A. H., *The Outlook for Literature.* London, Macmillan. 8s. 6d.
- TICKELL, R. E., *Thomas Tickell and the 18th Century Poets.* London, Constable. 16s.
- WALDOCK, A. J. A., *Hamlet. A Study in Critical Method.* Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.
- WYAT, THOMAS, *Plutarch's Quyetie of Mynde.* Ed. by C. R. Baskervill. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.

German.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- RÖHL, H., und F. NORMAN, *Wörterbuch zur deutschen Literatur.* Leipzig, B. G. Teubner; London, G. Bell. 6s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle High German.*

- BRINKMANN, H., *Sprachwandel und Sprachbewegungen in althochdeutscher Zeit (Jenaer germanistische Forschungen, xviii).* Jena, Frommann. 13 M. 50.
- Der deutsche Abrogans, Textab.*, herausg. von G. Baesecke (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, xxx). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.

Mittelniederdeutsche Fastnachtspiele. Herausg. von W. Seelmann. Dresden, K. Wachholtz. 2 M. 70.

(c) *Modern German.*

Barockkomödie, Die deutsche, herausg. von W. Flemming (Deutsche Literatur, xiii, 4). Leipzig, Ph. Reclam. 8 M. 20.

BARTHEL, H., Der Emmentaler Bauer bei J. Gotthelf. Münster, H. Aschendorff. 5 M.

BAUMGART, H., Goethes lyrische Dichtung in ihrer Entwicklung und Bedeutung. I. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 10 M. 50.

CHAMBERLAIN, H. S., Goethe. Volksausgabe. Munich, Bruckmann. 4 M. 80.

DJORDJEWITSCH, M., Ch. Sealsfields Auffassung des Amerikanertums und seine literarische Stellung (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, lxiv). Weimar, Duncker. 6 M. 60.

EINSIEDEL, W. VON, Die dramatische Charaktergestaltung bei H. von Kleist (Germanistische Studien, cix). Berlin, E. Ebering. 5 M.

ELOESSER, A., Die deutsche Literatur. II. Von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart. Berlin, B. Cassirer. 20 M.

FLEMMING, W., Der Wandel des deutschen Naturgefühls vom 15. zum 18. Jahrhundert (Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, Buchreihe xviii). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 7 M.

Goethe-Kalender. Herausg. vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. Leipzig, Dieterich. 4 M.

GÖRNER, O., Vom Memorabile zur Schicksalstragödie (Neue Forschungen, xii). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 5 M.

GRILLPARZER, F., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von A. Sauer: fortgeführt von R. Backmann. I, xvii. Vienna, A. Schroll.

HAGNAUER, E., Gotthelf und seine Zeit. Bern, Haupt. 2 M. 80.

HELLER, O., Faust and Faustus: A Study of Goethe's Relations to Marlowe (Washington Univ. Studies: Lang. and Lit., ii). St Louis, Washington Univ.

HOFFMEISTER, J., K. von Barths Leben, Werke und sein Deutscher Phönix (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, N.F. xix). 15 M.

HOHENSTEIN, F. A., Weimar und Goethe. Ereignisse und Erlebnisse. Berlin, Deutsche Buchgemeinschaft. 4 M. 90.

HOHLENBERG, J., Goethes Faust im 20sten Jahrhundert. Basel, Geering. 5 M. 20.

KAUFMANN, F. W., Die realistische Tendenz in Grabbes Dramen: E. G. Kolbenheyer als Dichter des Lebensproblems (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xii, 4). Northampton, Mass., Smith College. 75 c.

KEHL, H., Stilarten des deutschen Lustspiel-Alexandriners (Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, xxxi). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M.

MAHL, I., Der Prosastil in den Märchen Clemens Brentanos (Germanistische Studien, cx). Berlin, E. Ebering. 5 M.

MÜLLER, A., Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik (Deutsche Literatur, Romantik, iii). Leipzig, Ph. Reclam. 7 M. 50.

MUMBAUER, J., Die deutsche Dichtung der neuesten Zeit. I. Freiburg, Herder. 12 M.

MUSCHG, W., Gotthelf. Die Geheimnisse des Erzählers. Munich, C. H. Beck. 13 M.

NAGL, J. W. und J. ZEIDLER, Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. iii, 7, 8. Herausg. von E. Castle. Vienna, C. Fromme. Each 14 Sch.

OSTWALD, W., Goethe, Schopenhauer und die Farbenlehre. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, Unesma. 4 M.

- PAHL, TH., Quellenstudien zu Luthers Psalmenübersetzung. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 22 M.
- RICKERT, H., Goethes Faust. Die dramatische Einheit der Dichtung. Tübingen, Mohr. 18 M.
- RILKE, R. M., Briefe und Tagebücher aus der Frühzeit 1899-1902. Herausg. von R. Sieber-Rilke und C. Sieber. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 7 M. 50.
- ROOT, W. H., German Criticism of Zola, 1875-1893 (Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies). New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- ROSE, W., Men, Myths and Movements in German Literature. London, G. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.
- SCHULTZ, H. M., Raabe-Schriften. Eine systematische Zusammenstellung. Wolfenbüttel, Heckner. 5 M.
- WIESE, B. von, Lessing: Dichtung, Ästhetik, Philosophie. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 8 M.
- WITKOP, PH., Goethe: Leben und Werk. Stuttgart, Cotta. 6 M. 30.
- ZEYDEL, E. H., L. Tieck and England. A Study in the Literary Relations of Germany and England. Princeton, N.J., Princeton Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 15s.

THE CASE FOR NICHOLAS GRIMALD AS EDITOR
OF 'TOTTELL'S MISCELLANY'

THE first edition of the *Songes and Sonettes*, usually called *Tottell's Miscellany*, was finished on June 5, 1557. It contained 271 poems, of which 40 were ascribed to the Earl of Surrey, 97 to Sir Thomas Wyatt, 40 to Nicholas Grimald, and 94 to 'Uncertain Authors.' Eight weeks after this, on July 31, 1557, Tottell issued a second edition made up of 280 poems—there are, in fact, two distinct settings bearing this date, which, although they agree in the arrangement of the poems, disagree textually. The edition of July 31 differed from the first in many important respects: (i) 39 new poems by 'Uncertain Authors' were added, (ii) 30 poems by Nicholas Grimald, chiefly those of a personal nature, were suppressed, (iii) Grimald's remaining 10 poems were transferred to the end of the book and his initials were substituted for his name at the head of them, (iv) 4 additional poems by Surrey and 6 by Wyatt which stood at the end of the first edition were placed with the main body of their respective author's work, (v) the 'Answers' were placed immediately after the poems to which they purported to reply, (vi) one of Wyatt's poems was transposed to the section of 'Uncertain Authors,' (vii) 11 poems by 'Uncertain Authors' were placed in a different order among the 39 new poems, and (viii) a table of first lines was added. No more changes, other than textual corruptions and misprints, were introduced into the later sixteenth-century editions of the *Miscellany*.

That the *Miscellany* was an edited version was discovered over a century ago. G. F. Nott, comparing the *Miscellany* with certain early manuscripts of Wyatt and Surrey's poems, found that Tottell's text had been modernised 'to reduce as much as possible the lines to the iambic measurement of five equal feet¹.' Nevertheless, later editors of Wyatt and Surrey continued to reprint the text of the *Miscellany* until Flügel, Padelford, and Miss Foxwell, in the early years of this century, definitely established the superiority of the pre-1557 manuscripts over Tottell's version.

Most English scholars since the time of Arber and Henry Morley have regarded Grimald as the probable editor of the *Songes and Sonettes*. The

¹ G. F. Nott, *The Works of Henry Howard Earl of Surrey and of Sir Thomas Wyatt the Elder*, 1816, II, p. 537.

main reasons in favour of this view were first clearly set forth by Arber in the Introduction to his reprint of the *Miscellany* in 1870, as follows:

We know that he [i.e., Grimald] was previously in business relations with the Printer of this work: for Tottell had printed in 1556, Grimald's translation of Cicero's *De Officiis*, dedicated by him, as his humble 'Oratour,' to Thirleby, Bishop of Ely: and on the 23 April 1558, Tottell finished a Second edition of the same work.... Furthermore, the only poems suppressed in the revision, are Grimald's own. It may, therefore, be fairly guessed that Grimald, if not the Originator, was the chief Editor of this Collection of Poetry upon a plan then new to English Literature.

But the most recent editor of the *Songes and Sonettes* rejects this view. In his indispensable edition of the *Miscellany* Professor Rollins points out the difficulties, perhaps inadequately apprehended by its originator, of Arber's theory, stigmatises it as 'based upon unimpressive reasoning,' and declares that it entirely fails to account for the re-editing of the work and the suppression of 30 of Grimald's poems in the July 31 edition. He prefers to believe that Tottell himself was 'the guiding spirit, or editor, behind the book,' inasmuch as 'the combination of editor-printer-publisher in one man was common' in the sixteenth century, and because 'in his preface Tottell speaks with evident indignation of those who have "hoarded up" this beautiful verse¹.' 'The disappearance of Grimald's name and of his highly personal poems' in the second edition he imputes to the poet's complaints to Tottell; Grimald, he argues, shared the well-known prejudice of the courtier poets against the printing of their original lyrics and so prevailed upon Tottell to omit 30 of his personal poems from the July 31 edition. Colour is lent to this view by the fact that of the ten poems by Grimald allowed to remain in that and subsequent editions no less than nine are known to be translations, the publication of which, it is suggested, entailed no breach of good form among the gentlemen-scholars of the mid-sixteenth century. Professor Rollins finds further support for his theory in the revision which Grimald's remaining ten poems underwent between June 5 and July 31, 1557, and in the fact that this revision was of the same character as that applied to the poems of Wyatt and Surrey before they were printed in the first edition. Finally, he adduces the occurrence of the same type of smoothing in the *Miscellany* version of Surrey's poems and in Tottell's edition of Surrey's translation of *Aeneid II and IV* printed also in 1557 as evidence that, directly or indirectly, Tottell 'was responsible for the changes which seem to have been made from Surrey's original readings, or else that some other person had already made the changes before the copy came into Tottell's hands².'

¹ H. E. Rollins, *Tottell's Miscellany* (1557-1587), II, 1929, p. 93.

² Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 89.

It is my endeavour here to show that this theory is open to the same charge of being based on 'unimpressive reasoning' that its author brings against Arber's, and that the facts are susceptible of an interpretation very favourable to editing by Grimald.

1. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOUR OF GRIMALD'S EDITORSHIP.

Nicholas Grimald was born at Leighton Bromswold, Hunts., about 1519¹. After a distinguished career as a student, first at Cambridge, then at Oxford², he was appointed tutor at Christ Church, on the re-founding of that college by Henry VIII in 1547. Wood states that Grimald 'read lectures on Rhetoric in the refectory there³.' From the outset of his career classical scholarship and literary composition were Grimald's chief interests. This is abundantly clear from his having written his first Latin play, *Christus Redivivus*, as early as 1541 and from the dedicatory epistle to that play. Moreover, soon after he left Oxford, about 1551, in order to become a Protestant preacher, Grimald attracted the notice of Ridley, then Bishop of London, as 'a man of much eloquence both in the English and also in the Latin.' Ridley appointed Grimald to be his chaplain. In the letters he wrote from his prison at Oxford during 1554 and 1555 Ridley makes it clear that it was Grimald's learning—not any sectarian zeal—that made him valuable to the Protestant leaders and so involved him in the religious troubles of Mary's reign⁴.

Grimald was imprisoned for a while in the Marshalsea by the Catholic authorities, but seems to have made his peace with them at the end of 1554 or early in 1555. From this time until his death, about 1559, he held aloof from the religious conflict. Like Cheke and Udall, Grimald was primarily a humanist and cared more for the spread of classical learning

¹ In *A funerall song, vpon the deceas of Annes his moother*, Grimald says he was born at 'Browns hold.' Neither Merrill in *The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, 1925, nor the Place-Name Society in *The Place-names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire*, 1926, record this form exactly. But in some pleadings dating from 1554-5, among the Town Depositions of Mary's reign, the form 'Leighton Brownes hold' appears (*P.R.O.* c. 24/34).

² Merrill states, *op. cit.*, p. 12, that Grimald returned to Cambridge in 1544 in order to receive the degree of M.A. This is an error due to confusing Grimald with another Christ's College man, Nicholas Grenewall. The two are treated separately in J. A. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. G. C. Taylor uses this mistake to buttress his argument in *The Christus Redivivus of Nicholas Grimald and the Hegge Resurrection Plays*, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, xli, pp. 840-59.

³ Bodleian MS. Wood C. 8, f. 1v.

⁴ In one of his letters Ridley wrote of Grimald: 'I could appoint wherein he might occupy himself to his own profit in learning which he liketh' by translating and commenting on theological works. The Catholic attack on Grimald was inspired by animosity towards Ridley's literary henchman. To the Catholics Grimald was dangerous, not because of the violence of his opinions, the tenacity with which he held them, or the fervour with which he propagated them, but because of his scholarship—for what he might write against them.

than for the triumph of either of the warring sects¹. His devotion to scholarship and literature found speedy expression, after the quenching of his Protestant hopes, in his translation of the *De Officiis*, printed by Tottell in 1556, in the dedication of which he wrote:

Having recourse of late . . . to ye olde studies yt I once applied in ye universitie: and getting some frute of quiet life to the perusing, and recording of those things, wherewith in time past I felt myself greatly both delited, and furered: I gaue my minde chiefly to suche kinde of lerning: as wold serue best bothe to the order of my studie, and also to the governāce of my life.

The range of Grimald's interests, the nature of his 'olde studies,' and the bent of his mind towards the classics are amply illustrated by the titles of his English and Latin works as given by Bale, who was the poet's great admirer and close friend². The most significant entries refer to several collections of verses—songs, epigrams, complimentary pieces, translations from the Latin, and, most important of all, a 'restoration' (*restitutionem*) of the text of Wyatt's English *Psalms* which had been corrupted by copyists. Not only had Grimald written these before 1557, but he had also supplied Bale with several mediæval Latin works as well as one or two volumes of English verse by contemporaries—*Sonettos Italico More* by Edmund, Lord Sheffield, and *Rhythmos Anglicos*, by George Boleyn, Lord Rochford, both of whom were probably laid under contribution for Tottell's *Miscellany*. Bale evidently knew Grimald as not only a classical scholar, a translator and a poet, but as a student of rhetoric and English versification, a collector of the work of contemporary poets, and an 'improver' of the text of Wyatt—all qualifications that were possessed by none of the other contributors to the *Miscellany* who were living in 1557³.

¹ Thomas Warton, with admirable discernment, wrote of Grimald: 'theology does not seem to have been his talent, nor the glories of martyrdom to have made any part of his ambition,' *Hist. of English Poetry*, ed. 1871, iv, p. 50. Foxe also called him 'a man who had more store of good gifts than of great constancy.' Further testimony that Grimald's reputation rested on his learning rather than on his religion may be found in the *Ludicra sive Epigrammata Iuuenilia*, etc., of John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, ed. 1573, p. 76.

² *Scriptorum Illustrum Maioris Brytaniae... Catalogus*, Basle, 1557, p. 701; and *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, Oxford, 1902, pp. 302-4.

³ Only three of the other known contributors who were living in 1557 can be seriously considered as likely editors of the *Miscellany*—John Harington, Thomas Churchyard, and Thomas Norton. Professor Rollins (*op. cit.*, ii, pp. 89-92) deals fairly and convincingly with Nott's theory that John Harington initiated and edited *Songes and Sonettes*. Churchyard, in *Churchyard's Challenge*, 1593, declared that 'many things in the booke of songs and Sonets, printed then [i.e., in Mary's reign] were of my making.' He would have been proud to claim the editorship of what was in 1593 a famous book, if he could have done so. Norton's claim has never been seriously advanced, but it is noteworthy that in 1551 he had joined with Grimald in prefixing complimentary verses to William Turner's *A Preservative*, etc., and that when Tottell was Warden of the Stationers' Company in 1562 Norton became the Company's standing counsel. But his association with Tottell began after 1557 and only one of his poems is known to be in the *Miscellany*, so Norton's claim cannot be considered as strong as Grimald's.

And finally it is of great importance to note that of all the living contributors Grimald alone is known to have had personal dealings with Tottell at this time.

2. RICHARD TOTTELL AND THE ORIGIN OF THE 'MISCELLANY.'

Professor Rollins adopts the view that the *Miscellany* was based on one or more private manuscripts, which, 'in one way or another, by accident, gift, loan, purchase,' passed into the possession of Tottell, who was responsible for printing the poems in one volume. On this theory it is possible, particularly if the printer was using a manuscript only recently written in 1557, 'that most of the editing had been done before Tottell saw the manuscript, and that he (or his "corrector of the press") made few alterations beyond giving each poem a title, inadvertently corrupting the text by misprints, and adding' the additional poems by Wyatt and Surrey which were probably not in the original manuscript. On the other hand, 'the manuscript followed by Tottell may... have been written piecemeal from, say, about 1520 to 1557, in which case editing was necessary after it came into his possession¹.' I shall show later that the poems were most probably edited after they reached Tottell.

The recent discovery in America of a fragmentary *Boke of Balettes*², bound up as the end-papers of a copy of the 1551 edition of More's *Utopia*, came too late to be noticed by Professor Rollins, but seems likely to complicate future discussion concerning the origin of *Tottell's Miscellany*. But until the relation of the *Boke* to the two fragments of the *Courte of Venus* has been further worked out, the most that can be said is that these two publications, both containing, in different texts, poems by Wyatt that are found, again in a different text, in *Tottell's Miscellany*, were circulating side by side with the *Miscellany*, and 'with a reasonable possibility that they antedated Tottell.' From the frequent references to them in the works of the more extreme reformers between 1550 and 1570, and from the fact that only fragments of the books have survived, it is evident that both volumes enjoyed a popularity comparable with that of the *Miscellany* itself. If Tottell appropriated any of the poems from the *Boke of Balettes* or the *Courte of Venus*, the texts of those poems were re-edited before they appeared in the *Miscellany*. But that Tottell himself revised these poems (if any were taken)

¹ Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 93.

² See *Times Lit. Supplement*, July 5, 1928, p. 504; July 12, 1928, p. 520; December 26, 1929, p. 1097; and September 4, 1930, p. 700; also C. C. Stopes, *Shakespeare's Industry*, 1916, pp. 291 ff.

and such others as were printed direct from manuscript is in the highest degree unlikely, considering the consistent nature of the textual emendations and the character and attainments of the printer.

Richard Tottell was the third son of a fishmonger of Exeter. Since his father took a prominent part in the life of the city and his eldest brother Geoffrey became a notable lawyer, it is a legitimate assumption that Richard Tottell—until he was apprenticed to William Middleton, a London printer, about 1540—received the ordinary education then provided for the sons of prosperous merchants. Shortly after 1550 he took over the business and premises of Henry Smithe, a printer chiefly of law books. There is no evidence that after going to London Tottell had any education beyond the vocational training usually given to apprentices. Moreover, in the Preface to his edition of *Magna Carta and the Statutes*, 1556, although he dwells with justifiable pride on the improvements he has effected in the paper, print, and price of law books, yet he begs his customers 'to beare with such imperfectiōs, as some must nedes haue growen through wāt both of skil in my self, & of furtherance by men more skilfull.' And again, in a strain of sincere humility, he confesses his lack of learning: 'my copies I might wel folow as thei were, but I could not my self correct them as they ought to be. Therfore in some works where I could, wth my entreatie or cost, procure learnede helpe¹, ye haue them not smally amended.'

Tottell was not given to making experiments in literary publishing. He was first and foremost an enterprising and far-sighted printer and bookseller. He was quick to see the advantages that control of the steady market in law books would give him, and with the monopoly of law printing as a foundation he soon built up a prosperous business. At first he supplemented his gains from the sale of law books by reprinting the 'best-sellers' of other stationers where these were not protected, and this may partly account for his issuing *Songes and Sonettes* in 1557. In this connexion it is interesting to note that Henry Sutton took out a licence to print the *Courte of Venus* some time between July 19, 1557, and July 9, 1558, and the conjecture has been advanced that this was an attempt to protect his copyright and to prevent Tottell from incorporating the *Courte of Venus* in his newly printed *Miscellany*, for 'such an absorption may have been the fate of the *Boke of Balettes* if it antedated the *Courte*, for as far as extant fragments enable us to judge the

¹ Unfortunately Tottell does not name any of his learned correctors, but of all the lawyers and scholars associated with him at this time it must be granted that Grimald was the most likely to have encouraged him to print a collection of the new poetry. See *The Library*, 4th series, viii, 1927, p. 204.

Courte of Venus holds within itself all the contents of the *Boke of Balettes*¹.

It can be stated most emphatically that Tottell was not in that succession of 'editor-printer-publishers' which was one of the glories of the first century of printing in England. Such printers as Caxton, the two Rastells, Richard Grafton, and Robert Copland were exceptions among the members of their craft. Tottell is not mentioned as editor in any of his non-legal publications. Moreover, the year 1557 was an unusually busy one for him and could have left him little time for editorial work, for in it he printed eleven books compared with his usual five or six². It is surely 'unimpressive reasoning' that, faced with these facts, leads to the conclusion that Tottell was 'the guiding spirit, or editor,' behind the *Miscellany*³.

Professor Rollins regards the Preface to *Songes and Sonettes* as partly an attack on the extreme dislike, which the courtier poets entertained, of allowing their lyrics to appear in print. The passage in question suggests that the poems now printed had been withheld from the public by the poets and their friends, the collectors of manuscripts; this was undoubtedly, as regards many of the poems, a statement of fact, but the statement was cleverly couched in language calculated to whet the curiosity of prospective purchasers; in fact it represents a very early stage in publishers' advertising⁴:

It resteth nowe (gentle rede) that thou thinke it not euill doon, to publish, to the honor of the Englishe tong, and for profit of the studious of Englishe eloquence, those workes which the vngentle horders up of such treasure haue heretofore enuied thee.

To detect, in this, signs of 'evident indignation' is a travesty of criticism. The whole Preface, with its well-informed references to Latin and Italian, the *exact* sources of the poets' inspiration, with its just discrimination, unique in early English criticism⁵, between the respective merits of Wyatt and Surrey as poets, and with its concern for two of Grimald's chief interests—the glory of the English language and the 'profit of the studious of Englishe eloquence'—contains no real disparagement of the courtier poets and those who had kept their verses

¹ R. H. Griffith in *Times Lit. Supplement*, September 4, 1930, p. 700.

² These books were of varied sizes and lengths. There are 1458 pages in More's *English Workes*. Surrey's translation of *Aeneid II and IV* contains 27 folios. Rastell's *Collection of all the Statutes* has 550 folios.

³ Since most of the verse in the *Miscellany* was inspired either by courtly love or by the classics, Professor Rollins' suggestion that Tottell may have been one of the 'Uncertain Authors' seems, to say the least, unlikely.

⁴ The Preface to *Songes and Sonettes* should be compared with Tottell's clever foreword to his edition of *Magna Carta and the Statutes*, 1556.

⁵ See E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 1929, p. 53.

private. And if Tottell hoped, as he here states, to print 'moe hereafter,' he could have had no possible motive for attacking the owners of manuscripts of court poetry. If it should prove, as seems likely, that the *Boke of Balettes* and the *Courte of Venus* were printed before the *Miscellany*, a good deal of Wyatt's verse was already in print, and 'indignation' would have been out of place.

Two conclusions are probably to be drawn from the references in Tottell's Preface to 'the rude skill of common eares' and 'that swinelike grossnesse' of the unlearned as well as from the appeal to the educated to defend the learned authors of the poems from ignorant detraction—first, that the writer of the Preface, whether Tottell or another, had an academic conception of poetry and refused to admit verse that had not, as he put it, a certain 'statelinesse of stile¹,' and second, that the appeal of the collection was to the educated—primarily, perhaps, to Tottell's lawyer patrons and customers who belonged to the Inns of Court.

3. THE OMISSION OF THIRTY POEMS BY GRIMALD FROM THE SECOND EDITION.

The chief objection to the theory that Grimald edited the *Miscellany* is the difficulty of believing that an editor would suppress thirty of his own poems in a second edition in order to make room for thirty-nine others by 'Uncertain Authors.' But it is to be noted that in the Preface to the first edition a promise was made of 'moe hereafter'—implying that, if the venture were well supported, either Tottell meant to print another collection or had more poems in hand and intended to add them in a second edition. Probably the latter was meant, since the thirty-nine new poems appeared in the second edition within eight weeks and Tottell is not recorded to have printed another anthology of courtly verse. When the need for a new edition became evident, Tottell may have desired—and very naturally—to keep the size of the book as near as possible to that of the first edition: this would entail the omission of certain poems if the new matter was to be included and the promise of more redeemed. Obviously Grimald's were the poems most fit for exclusion, being chiefly of a personal nature, complimentary verses,

¹ The Preface refers to Surrey and Wyatt by name and to the rest of the contributors as 'sondry good Englishe writers.' Grimald is not mentioned separately there, though his name is at the head of his poems. This could be accounted for by the supposition that he had a hand in writing the Preface—for he could not then praise his own verses. The knowledge and appreciation of foreign authors and the concern for the glory of the English language and 'eloquence' that characterise this Preface can be exactly paralleled from Grimald's Preface and Dedicatory Epistle to his translation of the *De Officiis*, printed by Tottell in the previous year.

epitaphs, and moral pieces—poems alien in tone and inspiration to the spirit of *amour courtois* that pervaded the greater part of the *Miscellany*; whereas the character of the new poems was exactly that of the bulk of the poems in the original edition¹. Classical allusion as elaborated by Grimald was not yet so popular as it afterwards became, therefore only those poems of his were retained which had a general appeal or were in close harmony with the spirit of the whole collection. Grimald, a scholar of educated taste, was more likely to realise this incompatibility than the printer Tottell. Moreover, unlike the majority of the contributors, he was a professional author and was unaffected by the courtiers' cult of anonymity². Grimald, churchman and apostle of humanism, would have rejoiced rather than lamented to see his moral, epigrammatic, and complimentary verses printed, for the appeal of the *Miscellany* was chiefly to the cultivated few. The *Carmen in laudem Grimmoaldi* printed by Merrill³, the prefixing by Grimald himself of personal complimentary verses to Turner's *A Preservative, etc.*, in 1551, and the Preface and Dedication which Grimald wrote in 1556 for his translation of the *De Officiis* indicate beyond a doubt that he was no 'vngentle horder up' of poems from the vulgar eye, but, as he himself expressed it, one who 'wisshed, many mo to be parteners of such sweetnesse, as I had partly felt myself.' Thus there is no evidence for the theory that Grimald's thirty poems were suppressed in the second edition of *Songes and Sonettes* because he objected to their publication as a breach of decorum. Nor is the fact that of the ten of his poems allowed to remain in the second edition nine were translations from the Latin evidence in favour of Professor Rollins' theory, since among the thirty poems suppressed were also many translations.

Merrill argued⁴ that Grimald's unpopularity with both Catholics and Protestants induced Tottell to remove his poems from the second edition lest they should injure the sale of the book. This contention is unsatisfactory and unhistorical, being based upon a misreading of the martyrs' letters and too great a trust in the prejudiced interpretation put upon them by Strype. Merrill was thus led to draw inferences from Grimald's actions during the first half of Mary's reign which the facts do not war-

¹ Once this substitution was effected and a meagre ten poems by Grimald remained, it would be natural for the editor or the printer to suppress his name and remove his poems to the end of the volume.

² Grimald, in fact, set forth the opposite view to that held by the courtiers that 'it were a discredit for a Gentleman, to seeme learned, and to shew him selfe amorous of any good Art.' See Preface to *De Officiis*, 1556.

³ *The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, 1925, p. 37.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 366.

rant. England was once more a Catholic country in 1557, and both Grimald and Tottell¹ were in sympathy with the prevailing régime. Moreover, the fact that a second edition of the *Miscellany* was necessary in less than two months after the publication of the first is convincing proof that Grimald's name and reputation were not having an adverse effect on Tottell's sales.

Professor Rollins points out² that the editor 'also exercised the functions of a censor, removing objectionable references and phrases,' especially derogatory comments on Catholicism and mention of the younger Wyatt who had been executed for rebellion in 1554. Tottell was less likely than Grimald to act thus. He was high in favour with Mary's judges and had never been 'troubled' by the authorities. Grimald, however, had had a bitter experience of the methods of Mary's government in 1554 and after his submission behaved with great circumspection throughout the rest of the reign³. From this point of view he would have been an ideal editor.

It is significant that of the contributors who were living in 1557 Grimald was the only one whose name was printed in the *Miscellany*. If he had been the editor, this would be understandable—if someone else edited the collection there seems no adequate reason why Grimald's name should have been printed and Thomas Norton's, Thomas Churchyard's, or John Heywood's, for instance, omitted.

In an ingenious note on the headings of the poems in the 1557 editions Professor Rollins says⁴: '... it is practically certain that all the titles... are editorial insertions. Some of them... are based on a flat misapprehension of which no author could possibly have been guilty. Others... scarcely fit the subject-matter, or... are differently worded' in the editions of June 5 and July 31, thus 'clearly revealing the editor's hand.' Professor A. W. Reed has pointed out that this statement is true for the poems of Wyatt, Surrey and the 'Uncertain Authors,' but not for those of Grimald⁵. The titles of Grimald's poems, especially the personal poems, are such as their author alone could have supplied, for in many of them

¹ Between 1553 and 1557 Tottell printed these Catholic books: *A Bouclier of the Catholike Fayth*, *The Comentaries of Don Leues de Avela* (glorifying the Catholic Emperor, Charles V), and Sir Thomas More's *English Workes*.

² Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 97.

³ It has not been noticed before that Grimald's will was enrolled among the wills in St Paul's Cathedral. He had been Ridley's chaplain, so this may indicate that he was allowed to maintain his connexion with St Paul's until his death. The will was written a few pages from the end of a volume containing wills proved from 1535 to 1560, but the folio on which it occurred is now missing. It would seem that Foxe was probably right when he asserted that Grimald died 'about the coronation of Queen Elizabeth.'

⁴ Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 98.

⁵ *The Year's Work in English Studies*, 1929, pp. 155-6.

there is no indication to whom they were addressed. Titles were given to poems only rarely in sixteenth-century manuscripts, hence some connexion is here implied between Grimald and the 'copy' for at least part of the *Miscellany*. The appropriateness of the titles of Grimald's poems is presumptive evidence that the printer was working from Grimald's own manuscript and tends to show that his poems stand in the first edition very much as he wrote them. This conclusion is reinforced by the curious fact that Grimald's poems and their titles appear in the *Miscellany* in a highly individual spelling, differing from that of the rest of the poems there printed and from the norm of Tottell's printing house at this time. Grimald especially affected the use of double vowels, particularly *oo* and *ee*, where a single one was, and is, more usual, and the frequency with which these combinations occur in his poems¹ and the comparative rarity of their appearance in the rest of the *Miscellany* can hardly be explained upon any other hypothesis than that the compositor had before him Grimald's own manuscript.

4. THE TEXTUAL EVIDENCE.

A. *The Edition of June 5, 1557.* It is difficult to believe that there was little or no interference with the text of the poems after they reached Tottell's printing house. For, in the first place, between June 5 and July 31, 1557, while the poems were undergoing revision for the second edition, drastic changes were incorporated in them which it is impossible to attribute to a compositor or to Tottell. Secondly, the alterations that distinguish the text of the first edition from the readings of the early and independent manuscripts are identical in character with the editorial changes which differentiate the edition of July 31 from that of June 5. Thus there are strong grounds for believing that in both cases the same 'improver' was at work. Professor Rollins admits 'that probability favours identity of editorship' as between the June 5 edition and the first setting of the edition of July 31.

From an exhaustive study of Egerton MS. 2711, which contains, in Wyatt's own handwriting, many of his poems which are found in the *Miscellany*, Miss Foxwell showed that the chief divergences between

¹ This list is by no means exhaustive: naamd, naamkouth, raarnesse; cheezil, ieewell, heew, to bee, seeldom, shee, subdeewd, vntreew, peeple, theeus [i.e. thieves], purseew, withdreew, meeters, extreem; hoonger, coomfort, coom, soomer, intoo, doo, mooue, disprooue, woont, coorage, troomp, soom [i.e. some], noorse, hoont, moother, mooneths, foord, woon [i.e. won], noombers, vndoon, twoo, begoon, outroon, becoom, soons [i.e. sons], woork, soondry, coonnyng, woorthy, doolfull, swoords, toomb, roores, moornyng [i.e. mourning].

Tottell's printed text and Wyatt's manuscript result from differences in the treatment of the decasyllabic line. Tottell shows

a distinct aim, to make the line a decasyllable or hendecasyllable by alternate weak and strong syllables of five iambic feet; the Devonshire and Egerton version [manuscripts of Wyatt's own time, and the latter Wyatt's autograph copy] give a wider scope to the line, by allowing trisyllabic feet, absence of weak stresses, and other devices to ensure not a regular alternation of weak and strong syllables, but a line with five strong stresses¹.

In thus obliterating the aim of Wyatt the editor of the *Miscellany* seems to have been trying to make Wyatt's poems acceptable to the new generation of readers that had grown up since the poet's death and was accustomed to greater regularity in iambic verse owing to the metrical reforms of Surrey. Hence the extreme care with which the *Miscellany* avoids Wyatt's initial strong stresses, his device of two strong stresses without an intervening weak one, his treatment of the third personal termination *-eth* as non-syllabic, and his employment of stressed *-er*, *-ed*, *-en*, and *-on*, at the end of lines. In many cases the positions of words in the line are changed simply in order to obtain the modern accentuation².

Tillyard has shown that the editor of the *Miscellany* emended without distinction the metrical irregularities in Wyatt's early verse, due to immaturity and lack of command of his medium, and the deliberate roughness of some of his later poems³. This apparent insensibility to metrical subtleties, however, is far from proving Professor Rollins' contention that the editor's 'chief qualification was the ability to count syllables and accents on his fingers, and thus to make the verses regular⁴.' For Wyatt's metre is regularised systematically according to a quantitative scheme that may have been derived from classical Latin poetry. There is little of the casual or haphazard about the textual alterations of the *Miscellany*. The carefully calculated changes revealed by a comparison of the manuscript and *Miscellany* versions of 'Vnstable dreame, accordyng to the place,' 'They flee from me, that sometime did me seke,' 'Al in thy loke my life doth whole depende,' and many more of Wyatt's poems, were not produced by Tottell or his compositor. It is incontestable that Wyatt's poems, as they appear in *Songes and Sonettes*, had been edited by someone who had a thorough knowledge of versifying as it had been practised by English poets since the death of Wyatt.

Professor Padelford long since demonstrated the unreliability of the

¹ *A Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poems*, 1909, p. 26.

² Cf. Egerton MS. 2711 and Tottell's versions of 'Ever my hap is slack and slowe in commyng.'

³ *The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 1929, pp. 20, 21, 153-5.

⁴ Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 94.

Miscellany text of Surrey's poems in comparison with that of the earliest and most trustworthy manuscripts¹ and proved that 'Surrey's outstanding contribution to prosody was his insistence that the metrical accent should be coincident with sentence stress and word accent, that is that the metrical accent should fall upon the words which are naturally stressed because of their importance, and upon the accented, rather than the unaccented, syllables of such words².' Thus it is not surprising that the changes introduced into Surrey's poems in the *Miscellany* were less drastic than those made in the text of Wyatt's, for his innovation was in itself a device for that greater regularity of verse movement which was the predominant concern of Tottell's editor. But in a few instances where Surrey disregarded his own principle the *Miscellany* corrects in order to obtain a smoother iambic movement³.

Thus, whereas the editor of the *Miscellany* radically changed the basis of Wyatt's prosody, he accepted whole-heartedly Surrey's main reforms in versification and applied them to Surrey's poems with a thoroughness only less remarkable than his complete lack of inspiration.

That Tottell's text of Surrey's translation of *Aeneid IV*, also printed in 1557, exhibits signs of a similar regularisation, when compared with Day's edition (which was probably printed three years earlier), proves nothing definite. But having regard to Grimald's association with Tottell as translator of Cicero the year before, and since Grimald's blank verse is notably smoother and more harmonious than Surrey's⁴, and in view of Gooze's tribute to Grimald as a translator of Vergil, where he is described as having made 'the lyke attempt' as Surrey⁵, many will hesitate to endorse Professor Rollins' confident conclusion that, 'since Tottell printed both works, surely it is reasonable to believe that, directly or indirectly, he was responsible for the changes which seem to have been made from Surrey's original readings, or else that some other person had already made the changes before the copy came into Tottell's hands⁶.'

¹ *The Manuscript Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Anglia*, xxix, pp. 284 ff.

² *The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey*, 1920, p. 37.

³ Some of Surrey's poems underwent revision in other respects before appearing in the *Miscellany*, e.g., 'Set me wheras the sunne doth parche the grene.' The iambic movement of the verse is improved, the poem is conventionalised, and its appeal is made more general —alterations paralleled in another sonnet: 'I neuer sawe my Ladye laye apart Her cornet blacke,' where, throughout the poem, Tottell substitutes the third personal pronoun for the second of the manuscript. It is clear from Padelford's note on this latter sonnet that Tottell's version was edited by someone who did not know the Petrarchan source of the poem, i.e. who was probably unacquainted with Italian.

⁴ Van Dam, *William Shakespeare, Prosody and Text*, 1900, pp. 239, 240, 267.

⁵ *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes*, the 'Epytaphes of maister Thomas Payre.'

⁶ Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 88-9.

The forty poems contributed to Tottell's first edition by Grimald, which we have already seen reason to believe were printed from Grimald's own manuscript, are remarkable for the machine-like regularity of their versification. In them accented and unaccented syllables follow each other with even greater uniformity than in Surrey's verses. Leaving aside his blank verse (which is the only verse of its kind in the *Miscellany* and is itself smoother than Surrey's), all Grimald's work in decasyllabic riming couplets, in Poulter's measure, and in the sonnet shows the influence of Surrey in its complete acceptance of his prosodic reforms. Grimald's variations from the rule that metrical accent shall always fall on the word which bears the sentence stress and on the syllable of that word normally stressed in speaking are much fewer than Surrey's; he is more sparing in his use of 'line-fillers'; and he differs again in more frequently using a trochee in the first foot of the line and immediately after the caesura. Although he never attains the heights of inspiration reached by Wyatt and Surrey, these are signs of individuality in Grimald's verse and indicate that his versification was originally more regular than Surrey's, even if it was revised for the *Miscellany*, which is very doubtful. Although no independent manuscript of Grimald's poems is known to exist, the available evidence points directly away from Professor Rollins' surmise 'that Grimald's verses were changed as much as those by the other contributors¹.' As they are printed they exhibit the same prosodic theories perfectly carried out (and they can hardly in this case have been superimposed) as the editor of the *Miscellany* attempted, with only partial success, to apply to the poems of Wyatt and Surrey—yet Grimald's individuality as a poet, far from being suppressed, is in them more fully realised.

From this we may infer either that all three sets of poems were worked over by a single editor whose level of inspiration and whose ideas on prosody were strangely like Grimald's, or that one of the three poets revised the work of the other two—if the latter, then the reviser must have been Grimald, since Wyatt and Surrey had been long dead.

Most of the manuscripts at the British Museum which contain poems by 'Uncertain Authors' were written after the publication of the *Miscellany*, hence no argument can properly be founded on them. Nevertheless, in some cases, where the manuscript renderings are not dependent upon the *Miscellany*, Tottell's versions of these anonymous poems are more regularly iambic than the texts of the manuscripts. It seems likely, therefore, that in dealing with these poems Tottell's editor followed his usual practice

of making metrical accent coincide with word accent, in cases where the manuscripts stress an unimportant syllable or inflexion, and with sentence stress where the manuscripts place the stress on insignificant articles or prepositions. Similarly he suppressed 'line-fillers' and was at times forced to tamper with the meaning of the original text. The variations in the following lines are typical:

then winter etes and empties all and thus autumnne is worne:	[MS. Titus A. xxiv]
The winter eates & empties all, and thus is Autumn worne:	[Tottell, 1]
what man can say today I liue tyll morow my life shall laste.	[MS. Titus A. xxiv]
No man can say today I liue, till morne my lyfe shall last.	[Tottell, 1]
Theseus frendshippe was not so greate: but Deuero was as muche.	[MS. Titus A. xxiv]
Ne Theseus frenship was so great, but Deuorox was as much.	[Tottell, 1]
Where ever he went eche man him caled the gentle Peragon.	[MS. Addit. 23971]
And where he went who cald him not the gentle Peragon.	[Tottell, 1]
And sodeinly even theare I saw a sea of sorowes prest:	[MS. Addit. 28635]
And sodeinly I saw a sea of wofull sorowes prest:	[Tottell, 1]
In wilfull riches I have found povertie, and in great pleasure I lyved in heauinesse,	[MS. Addit. 28635]
In riches finde I wilfull pouertie, In great pleasure liue I in heauinesse.	[Tottell, 1]

So far then the internal evidence is of a piece.

B. *The Edition of July 31, 1557.* The poems were again revised between June 5 and July 31, 1557. No explanation based solely on internal evidence can reveal who was responsible for this revision, but the nature of the textual alterations may throw some light on the reviser's attitude to his text. Professor Rollins distinguishes the two settings of July 31 as B and C and shows that B was set up 'from a carefully revised text' of the June 5 edition and that C was set up from B. I have relied throughout this section on his collations of the 1557 editions.

Surrey's poems suffered most in the revision for B and there can be little doubt—making allowances for the vagaries of the compositor and for a tendency to normalise spelling according to the current practice of Tottell's printing house—that many of the alterations are editor's revisions. The most sweeping changes occur in sheets A and B; they indicate a reviser whose aims were identical with those of the editor of

the first edition, for most of the emendations are attempts to regularise the movement of the verse¹.

The alterations to Wyatt's poems are of the same nature, but are nowhere so drastic as the reviser's corrections of Surrey's and occur fairly regularly throughout the whole body of the poems. The textual variations of B and C from the June 5 edition seem only rarely to have been due to the adoption of readings from manuscripts of Wyatt's poems. The reviser's aim was everywhere a smoother verse, the modernisation of word accent, and a more intelligible text, and the majority of his emendations were determined by his own taste.

As only ten of Grimald's poems were retained in the second edition there are considerably fewer textual alterations in them than in Wyatt's and Surrey's, yet the few changes introduced are exceedingly significant, for it is of paramount importance to determine whether or not they were such as would have been made by the author.

Only two poems show any deliberate interference with the text². The title of *The Muses* becomes *Of the ix. Muses* in the edition of July 31, and the fifth line of this poem, which originally read:

Clio in solem songes, reneweth old day,

is curiously altered to:

Clio in solem songes, reneweth all day.

As it stood in the June 5 edition the line was a conscious reminiscence of the opening verse of a Latin poem *Nomina Musarum*, long attributed to Ausonius,

Clio gesta canens, transactis tempora reddit.

By the change of *old* to *all* the point of the original is lost, an interference with the text which Grimald would hardly have countenanced. But this instance must not be pressed too far as evidence against revision by Grimald, for it is just possible that it was due to a compositor's error and loose proof-reading³.

The death of Zoroas furnishes one or two more examples of deliberate change. In the first edition the poem opens thus:

Now clattering arms, now ragyng broyls of warr
Gan passe the noyes of taratantars clang:

¹ For a discussion of the unique readings of B—the first setting of the July 31 edition—see Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 19.

² The changes in the remaining eight reprinted poems are mostly misprints and attempts to modernise spelling in accordance with Tottell's current practice; thus *Room* becomes *Rome*, *yies eies*, *Alisanders Alexanders*, *holl whole*, *sterr starre*, *becoom become*, *subdeewd subdued*, *fayls fails*, and *yt that*.

³ To the same cause should probably be ascribed the blunder *rankes* for original *renkes* in the sixteenth line of this poem. But see the note on *shinand* below.

For the second line the July 31 edition reads:

Gan passe the noyes of dredfull trompets clang:
again obscuring an echo of the classics, for the original line recalls Ennius,
Annales, II, 35:

at tuba terribili sonitu taratantara dixit¹.

Here again it is possible that the variation arose through a compositor's unfamiliarity with the onomatopœic word *taratantars*, which so far as is known had been used only once previously in recorded English².

In the first edition, in the twenty-third line of this poem, Grimald used the old northern form *shinand*, where the July 31 edition reads *shinyng*. Grimald's contribution to the first edition contained, besides a number of individual spellings, several archaic words, many of them words of some poetic warrant, such as are found in *Piers Plowman* and the works of Skelton, with which Grimald seems to have been familiar. This characteristic in Grimald's work may represent an early stage in the rise of poetic diction³. The change to *shinyng* may, therefore, very well be the 'improvement' of a compositor who was unfamiliar with northern forms.

These alterations do not show definitely whether or not Grimald's attenuated contribution was overseen by someone other than a compositor between June 5 and July 31, 1557. In every case where change is made the regular movement of the verse is preserved; nor is there anything to rule out revision by Grimald himself. As Professor Rollins admits, these changes seem to indicate 'an editor who, if not identical with the editor of [the June 5 edition], certainly shared his views and his methods⁴.'

There remain only the poems of 'Uncertain Authors.' As in the preceding three sections the compositor now and then modernises an archaic spelling, corrects a misprint of the first edition, and sometimes prints in full terminations which were contracted in the earlier edition. But throughout these anonymous poems are other, more pronounced changes, similar in character to the editorial alterations in the poems of Wyatt and Surrey. Sometimes the meaning is improved, sometimes obscured, but almost always the verse runs more smoothly as a result of these changes. The same means are adopted as for Wyatt's

¹ Besides the *Alexandreis* which he was translating, Grimald, no doubt, had also in mind *Aeneid*, IX, 503-4:

at tuba terribilem sonitum procul aere canoro
increpuit; sequitur clamor caelumque remugit.

² In Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*, 1553, f. 92 b.

³ It was probably due to the revival of interest in the old alliterative poetry signalled by Crowley's edition of *Piers Plowman*, 1550. G. F. Nott pointed out that the passage in which 'shinand' occurs is an imitation of part of Skelton's *Crowne of Laurell*.

⁴ Rollins, *op. cit.*, II, p. 88.

and Surrey's poems—stressed *-ing* of a present participle and non-syllabic *-er* and *-eth* are avoided, *-ed* of some past participles is made non-syllabic, the accent is made to fall upon the syllable of a word that is normally stressed in speech, a further attempt is made to reduce the number of 'line-fillers,' and a word or syllable is frequently added or left out, in order always to obtain a line of eight, ten, twelve, or fourteen syllables made up of perfect iambic feet. Some examples are appended.

- Rew Thestilis most woful man that liueth vnder sunne. [Tottell, 1]
- Rew Thestilis most woful man that liues vnder the sunne. [Ib. 11]
- And herken your herdmans sounde: [Ib. 1]
- And harke your herdmans sounde: [Ib. 11]
- Murdred with false disdaine. [Ib. 1]
- Hath murdred with disdaine. [Ib. 11]
- Lo, thus are all my ioyes gone: [Ib. 1]
- Lo, thus are all my ioyes quite gone: [Ib. 11]
- And that was ready is newest to begyn. [Ib. 1]
- And that was doon is newest to begyn. [Ib. 11]
- Although the caske be neuer so strong: [Ib. 1]
- Although the caske be set so strong: [Ib. 11]
- Grauen the within which I do here expresse: [Ib. 1]
- Grauen within which I do here expresse: [Ib. 11]
- Cruell and vnkind whom mercy cannot moue...
The ground of my grieve where pitie cannot proue:
To tickle to trust of all vntruth the traine. [Ib. 1]
- Cruell vnkind whom mercy cannot moue...
Ground of my grieve where pitie cannot proue:
Tickle to trust of all vntruth the traine. [Ib. 11]
- Spring of very spite, from whence whole fluddes do flow, [Ib. 1]
- Spring of all spite, from whence whole fluddes do flow, [Ib. 11]
- Haue I of fortune the fauour or the spite, [Ib. 1]
- Haue I of fortune fauour or despite, [Ib. 11]
- With golde and purple that nature hath drest. [Ib. 1]
- That nature hath with gold and purple drest. [Ib. 1]

The text of the July 31 edition, therefore, although it cannot be said to support the theory of Grimald's editorship in any definite way, affords no evidence incompatible with revision by him. Whoever the reviser was, he pursued very definitely the same ideal of smooth versification that moved the editor of the original collection to modify the verse structure of the poems. It is a reasonable probability that both the original and the amplified editions were overseen by the same person—a student of contemporary poetry is indicated, whose habit was to treat the form of a poem as something distinct from its substance and whose interest was in the movement and balance of the verse rather than in the appreciation of poetical experience: in short, such a scholar-poet, translator, and 'improver' of other men's verses as we know Grimald to have been.

H. J. BYROM.

LONDON.

'A MAN OF RELIGION'

THE character of Chaucer's 'poure persoun' conforms so nearly to the ideal of Wyclif's poor priests, that many attempts have been made to prove that Chaucer intended to portray a Lollard priest, possibly Wyclif himself. The arguments in favour of this interpretation have been examined by E. K. Maxfield (*Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, xxxix), who points out that hitherto no exclusively Lollard trait has been found in the description.

There still remain, however, certain points of interest which have escaped comment, the most remarkable being Chaucer's use of the term 'man of religion'—'a good man was ther of religioun.' The *New English Dictionary* cites examples of this term used with the definite meaning of 'a member of a religious order,' a use paralleled in Myrc's *Festial*, *Jacob's Well* and apparently quite normal in M.E. didactic works, in none of which is there any hint of a possibly less specialised meaning¹. The expression occurs in the Lollard tracts, where positive evidence of the normal usage occurs:

Also, whanne men speke of religion, anon þei undirstonden religion maad of synful men wiþ many errouris, and not of pat holy religion pat Criste, God and man, made hymself for his apostils and preestis; alle and gif religion founde of synful men, wiþ pride and ypocrisie, were betre þan þe clene religion in his clene fredom pat Crist made. And þus þei pat holden Cristis clene religion, as preestis, wiþouten cloutynge to of errouris of foolis and synful men, *ben holden secular men, or secular preestis*, þouȝ þei kepen nevere so wel þe gospel, and techen it frely and trewly, as Crist and his apostils diden. But gif þei han a newe habite, founden of mannis folye, and have maad singuler profession to synful men, and in cas, to fendis, þei ben holden *men of religion*; . . . þese newe religious fordon the reverence and þe name of Cristis clene religion, and maken pat it is holden for noon, as gif foolis or synful men wolden fordon Goddis makynge².

Examples might be multiplied, for the usage is quite common and appears to have lasted well into the sixteenth century. It is, therefore, curious to find Chaucer using the term to describe one who was obviously a secular priest. The only possible explanation seems to lie in the doctrine of Wyclif and his followers, who continually emphasise the fact that the

¹ In the passage on St James's definition of religion in the *Ancren Riwele* (ed. Morton, pp. 8-12) there is an apparent extension of meaning to include 'gode religiuse. . . i þe worlde, summe nomeliche prelaz & treowe prechures,' who visit the fatherless and widows (i.e. care for sinful souls). But the writer, though forced by the sense of the text to admit this, hastens on to those who 'ouer alle oðre religiuse' keep themselves unspotted from the world; and he continues: 'Vrom þe worlde witen him clene & unwemmed; her inne is religiun & nout iþe wide hod. . . .' By the fourteenth century to neither prelates nor preachers, other than the Friars Preachers, would the title of 'religious' be conceded.

² *Select English Works of Wyclif*, ed. by Arnold, London, III, p. 449.

religious orders are 'newe religious,' 'false religious,' and that, as is indeed suggested in the passage quoted above, the only true religious order is that of Christ and His apostles—the order of priesthood in true apostolic poverty—in fact, the Lollard 'poor priests.' The continual recurrence of this thought in the Lollard writings justifies the assumption that to Chaucer's contemporaries the term 'man of religion' applied to a secular priest, would have the significance of 'Lollard,' much in the same way that the special use of the word 'Friend,' although abnormal, is perfectly well understood by the average man to-day. If this is granted, it may not be going too far to suggest that the term 'poure persoun' may be the equivalent of 'poor curate' which is throughout the Lollard writings used to denote the 'poor priests.' If we allow that this description justifies the interpretation of the parson as a Lollard, other details fall into their proper place as corroborating evidence, pointing to a portrait of Wyclif himself, rather than of one of his followers.

The Parson is a learned man, unlike the average parson¹. He comes from a family of farmers (the ploughman is his brother) and has apparently been often in adversity; if Chaucer is referring to Wyclif, both these facts, which otherwise have little significance, are illuminating, for Wyclif's family², and his career, both fit the case. It would, of course, be absurd to stress the fact that Lutterworth was a wide parish 'with houses fer asonder' but at least Chaucer's description does not invalidate the theory.

The Parson's character agrees well with the ideal of priesthood set forth in the Lollard writings. His insistence upon 'Cristis loore and his Apostles twelve,' the true preaching of Christ's gospel, and the necessity of the priest's exemplifying his teaching in his own life is in accord with Wyclif's own views:

Poul techip in pis epistle how Cristene men shulden lyve togedere and holde hem ever in Cristis lawe, *pat is tauzt bi his apostlis*³.

Oure weiward prelatiſ, pat prechen not Cristis gospel, but letten opere pore preſtiſ to teche trewely and frely Goddis word, and senden freris pat colouren here open synne, and prechen fabliſ and leſyngiſ, and robben þe pore peple in ſtrange beggyng and nedles.

Also oure worldly preeſtiſ leſſe and more drawen fro holy Chirche. . . þe grete dewete of good enſample of here owene lif, pat ſchulde be a bok and mirroure of here ſugetiſ, to kepe Goddiſ heſtiſ, and ſeyntiſ and reſon wiſneſſen. Perfore Criſt dide fiſt in dede pat þing he tauzte aftir bi word, and whanne Criſt hadde waſchyn hiſ diſcipliſ feet for mekeneſſe, he ſeide þuſ, I zeve to ȝou enſample, pat ye do aſ I have don. But now inſtide of enſample of mekeneſſe and charite and holy devociſ in Goddiſ ſervice, þei ȝyven enſample of pride, wrapþe, vengeaunce, coveitiſe, ydelneſſe, glotenye, leccherie and opere viciſ, to wiþdrawe fro holynneſſe and devociſ⁴.

¹ See Deansley, *Lollard Bible*, p. 161.

³ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 272 (on 1 Thess. iv, 1).

² Workman, *John Wyclif*, I, p. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

It may be to the point to add here that the Parson's dislike of 'fables' is part of the Lollard doctrine, and quite contrary to the normal practice of the orthodox sermon-writers of his day. Wyclif's sermons are singularly free from all 'exempla,' and his very definite dislike of 'fables' leads him to explain away the phrase 'as þei fableden' in the description of the walk to Emmaus.

And here foolis arguen comunly, þat it is leueful to telle fablis, for þus diden þes two disciplis, after þat Crist was risun to liif. But graunte we first to þes foolis, þat whanne men speken fablis þei fablen in þer speche, and whanne þei fablen þei speken fablis, and þus þes two disciplis of Crist fabliden as þei schulden not, as apostlis synneden ofte, after þat Crist was risun to liif; but God forbode þat perfore Cristene men have leue to synne. But sum men seien þat fablyng is taken on two maneris; first, for speche of mannis dede þat is unknowun to oper men, þat sum men graunten and sum men denyen, for uncerteynte of þe dede; or fable is to speke fablis ydely, as many doon, and þis is algatis yuel; siþ Crist seiþ in þe gospel, þat of ech ydil word þat men speken, shulen þei rekene at þe day of dome¹.

And again on the command 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel,'

Bot þei schulden not preche cronyelis of þo world, as þo batel of Troye, ne oper nyse fablis, ne mannis lawes founden to wynne hom þo money².

These quotations are not isolated phrases, snatched from their context to fit a ready-made theory, but represent the continual attitude of the Lollard writings, expressed with wearisome insistence.

The Lollards, of course, went on foot, staff in hand, in accordance with their doctrine of poverty, which taught them to have 'suffisaunce in litel thing.' It is true that certain orthodox sermon-writers mention the duty of priestly poverty in a rather perfunctory manner, but Chaucer's emphasis seems more in accord with Wyclif's passionate insistence upon the necessity of following St Paul's maxim to be content with food and covering, 'Whanne we han fode and hilyng holde we us paied³.'

The same doctrine led Wyclif to protest against the normal custom of 'cursing for tithes.' This was not a mere abuse practised by worthless priests, but a definite part of the 'great curse' (later represented by the 'Commination' of the reformed Church), and meets with the full approval of Myrc, who seems to have been a good priest, and of the author of *Jacob's Well* who, despite his partiality to 'fables' and his approval of 'cursing for tithes,' is assumed by Dr Brandeis to be 'a parish priest or parson of the Chaucerian type⁴.' There is no need to do more than refer to the numerous writs of 'significavit' to prove the frequency of the

¹ Workman, *op. cit.*, II, p. 133.

² *Ibid.*, II, p. 129.

³ *Ibid.*, III, p. 147.

⁴ *Jacob's Well* (E.E.T.S.).

'cursing for tithes,' and the singularity of Wyclif's attack on it¹. It was part of Wyclif's doctrine also that the priest should give of his superfluity to his poor parishioners: 'Sith seyntes seyn, and resoun approves hit, pat richesses pat clerkes have schulden be pore mennis godis².'

The *Parson's Tale*, it has been suggested by Simon, is a Lollard sermon on penitence, with 'monkish interpolations' added after Chaucer's death. There is, however, nothing in the tale which would be incongruous in the mouth of Wyclif. The section on 'Confession' is unusually brief and indefinite, and accords with Wyclif's admission that

Confession maad to trewe prestis and witty in Goddis lawe, do moche good to synful men, so pat contriccioun for synnes before don come perwip, and good lif and keping Goddis hestis and werkis of mercy don to pore men, sue after³.

That the Parson should treat the seven deadly sins fully in his tale is quite in line with Wyclif's practice. He, or one of his near followers, wrote a lengthy treatise on the subject in English; there exists a Latin tract attributed to Wyclif; and the poor priests were instructed by him to teach the people the Paternoster, Commandments and the Seven Deadly Sins in their mother tongue⁴.

The objection that the biblical quotations in the *Tale* do not agree with the Lollard Bible is of little consequence⁵, since the quotations in Wyclif's own English sermons and tracts by no means agree with the versions in the Lollard Bible⁶.

Nor is the objection of much account that Chaucer quotes the orthodox authorities more often than one would expect a Lollard to do, since it seems to have been part of the Lollard campaign to hoist their enemies with their own petard. The English tracts are profuse in references to the stock authorities of the Middle Ages—Bede, St Bernard, Grosseteste and St Francis—and even more to the early fathers; curiously, both the Parson and Wyclif seem to use St Augustine most frequently as their authority.

There still remain two difficulties, which, however, are not insuperable. It has been objected that Chaucer would have seen the manifest absurdity of sending Wyclif on a pilgrimage to St Thomas of Canterbury. It must be remembered that the Canterbury pilgrimage is, after all, only a literary device, and cannot, therefore, be stressed too heavily; more-

¹ See Workman, *op. cit.*, II, p. 25.

² Wyclif, *Select English Works*, III, p. 158.

³ *Op. cit.*, III, p. 284. In this connexion it is interesting to note that Chaucer leaves out entirely the discussion on the necessity of confession, which figures prominently in the work of Peraldus. Presumably the Parson would not have introduced such a controversial theme into a sermon preached to the pilgrims, if his Lollard doctrines were likely to be attacked.

⁴ Workman, *op. cit.*, II, p. 203.

⁵ G. W. Landrum, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, XXXIX, p. 87.

⁶ Workman, *op. cit.*, II, p. 178.

over, we do not even know that the Parson *was* on pilgrimage—he may, for all we know, simply have been on his way to Canterbury for quite different reasons. Even if we are reduced to believing that he must have been on pilgrimage, there is no absolute impossibility in Chaucer's being unaware of the Lollard dislike of pilgrimages—the pilgrims themselves, at all events, seemed to think it quite possible that there was a 'Loller' among them. In fact, the English tracts are almost entirely free from attacks on pilgrimages, and Wyclif surprisingly seems to have had a special reverence for St Thomas.

The other objection is that Chaucer would not have drawn so sympathetic a portrait if he were not himself a Lollard, and that, in any case, it would hardly be safe for him to write so fervently of Wyclif. The first point seems to overlook Chaucer's obvious tolerance towards all types and beliefs; the second ignores several rather significant facts. Courtenay's mandate for the excommunication of the Lollards Hereford and Ripington in 1382 does not mention Wyclif, nor were any steps apparently taken to prevent his ministration at Lutterworth, despite the wholesale persecution of the 'poor priests.' The suggestion that this clemency was due to Wyclif's recantation has been definitely disproved¹. It may partly have been through respect for his character, but in view of the fact that in 1384 Wyclif claimed that John of Gaunt was protecting his 'poor priests,' it seems more probable that fear of his patron was the ruling motive—possibly Gaunt was willing to allow the persecution of the Lollards to proceed, on the understanding that Wyclif was untouched. Now, since Gaunt was Chaucer's patron, it is not so unlikely that he would feel safe in speaking well of Wyclif. It is interesting to note in this connexion Wyclif's testimony to his early friendship with Strode—a friendship which no doubt gave way before increasing divergence of thought, but which might still be sufficiently remembered by Strode to enable him to give Chaucer an appreciative account of Wyclif's character. It is unfortunate that no credence can be given to Wood's delightful legend that Wyclif, as Warden of Canterbury Hall, had young Chaucer for his pupil. This would give a special significance to Chaucer's tribute, but the legend is quite discredited, and we can only guess that Chaucer may have known Wyclif either through Gaunt or Strode. This is, of course, pure fancy of the kind for which there can be no evidence. It is hoped, however, that some of the earlier points made may prove to be less fanciful.

DORIS V. IVES.

WESTCLIFF, ESSEX.

¹ Workman, *op. cit.*, pp. 294 ff.

SOUTHEY'S RELATIONS WITH FINLAND AND SCANDINAVIA

It does not appear that Southey as a young man had any knowledge of Old Norse. However, that did not prevent him from gaining information about the Norsemen in a roundabout way nor from planning works based on their history or beliefs. Thus on July 31, 1796, he was preparing his 'Norwegian tale of Harfagre¹.' Of even older date was a scheme for a series of narrative poems on the most remarkable forms of mythology in the world, among which was to be one dealing with the religion of the Norsemen. This idea suggested itself while Southey was still a schoolboy at Westminster², and in spite of the various projects which beckoned him away, he toyed with the old plan from time to time. Thus on January 4, 1799, he wrote to William Taylor criticising the unseemly haste with which Amos Cottle had made his translations of Icelandic poetry and added: 'It would be my intention, if I could speculate upon leisure some three years hence, to build up a Runic song³.' After an interval of two years he again referred to his design: 'I purpose metrical romances upon the basis of Hindoo, Persian and Runic mythology. The Persian seed is sown. Give me four years' life and I will complete all⁴.' On January 23, 1803, he once more touched on the matter briefly: 'The Runic mythology will come under my hands in its turn⁵,' and when another two years had passed, he told Taylor: 'You will see my Hippogryff touch at Hindostan, fly back to Scandinavia, and then carry me among the fire-worshippers of Istakhar. . . . Only let me live long enough and earn leisure enough, and I will do for each of these mythologies what I have done for the Mohammedan⁶.' There is no record of how Southey conceived of this Norse romance. Indeed it is doubtful if he ever worked out anything like a draft, but among the notes in his *Commonplace Book* we find the following: 'The conquests of Odin were suggested by Gibbon; but Odin must be the god, not the hero. The story must be wholly imaginary. The history of savages is never important enough to furnish an action for poetry⁷.' In point of fact, this scheme was never carried out, for the unfavourable reception of *Madoc* checked the soaring flight of Southey's winged steed.

¹ *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, I, p. 287.

² Preface to *Collected Poems*, v. iii.

³ Taylor, *Memoir*, ed. Robberds, I, p. 246.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, p. 371.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, p. 111.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, p. 447.

⁷ *Commonplace Book*, IV, pp. 11-12.

It was as a result of his friendship with Amos Cottle that Southey first displayed some acquaintance with Old Norse poetry. In the autumn of 1797 he visited the Cottles at Bristol and found that Amos was translating the *Edda* for the benefit of his brother Joseph. He had begun a prose rendering, but on Southey's advice turned it into verse and in the course of six weeks he had the book half printed. Southey's scholarly mind disapproved of this haste, but he hoped that the translation would make the 'Runic tales' more familiar, and perhaps 'give a good direction to the genius of some young man,' into whose hands it might fall¹. He himself contributed an introductory poem to the volume, which appeared at the end of 1797. After recalling the pleasant days which he and the Cottles had spent that year at Barton, he continues:

But now I know
Thro' wildest scenes of strange sublimity,
Building the Runic rhyme, thy Fancy roves;
Niflhil's nine worlds, and Surtur's fiery plain,
And where upon Creation's uttermost verge,
The weary Dwarfs, that bear the weight of Heaven,
Hope the long winter that no spring must cheer,
And the last sound that from Heimdaller's trump
Shall echo thro' all worlds, and sound the knell
Of earth and heaven.

Then follows a rapid sketch of the effect of their religion on the old Norsemen:

A strange and savage faith
Of mightiest power! it fram'd the unfeeling soul
Stern to inflict and stubborn to endure,
That laugh'd in death. When round the poison'd breast
Of Regner clung the viper brood, and trail'd
Their coiling length along his festering wounds,
He, fearless in his faith, the death-song pour'd,
And lived in his past fame; for sure he hoped
Amid the Spirits of the mighty dead
Soon to enjoy the fight. And when his sons
Avenged their father's fate, and like the wings
Of some huge eagle spread the severed ribs
Of Ella, in the shield-roof'd hall they thought
One day from Ella's skull to quaff the mead,
Their valour's guerdon.

This passage is of interest as showing Southey's familiarity with the story of the death of Ragnar Lodbrog², but it is still more interesting because of its associations with Sir Walter Scott. In *The Heart of Midlothian*³, Scott portrays the austere Davie Deans, after Effie's disgrace

¹ Taylor, *Memoir*, I, p. 246.

² He probably read of it in Percy's *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry*. A footnote shows that at this period he also knew the commentary of Stephanus Stephanus on Saxo Grammaticus, where the story is discussed. Cf. also Southey's *Commonplace Book*, IV, p. 38.

³ Ch. XII.

has become known to him, reading his Bible by the fire, and to emphasise his unbending nature the above lines are recalled: 'He boasted, in no small degree, the attributes which Southey ascribes to the ancient Scandinavians, whom he terms "firm¹ to inflict, and stubborn to endure."' "

Attracted by the rugged virtues of the old Norsemen, in 1814 Southey was planning a 'Runic romance' for which he would have to read the sagas, but that meant learning a new language, and so even then he had a premonition that the design would never be executed². In 1822, however, he began to study the *Edda* more seriously. On October 14 he wrote to Warter that he had added to his collection the first two volumes published at Copenhagen and that the third would soon complete the work³. On January 31, 1832, he asked Warter, who was then in Denmark, to send the third volume, as he despaired of obtaining it from 'Hamlet the Dane⁴,' and on August 15 he announced that he had received it and also a copy of the *Icelandic Gospels*⁵. He was wont to pursue his linguistic studies in conjunction with a member of his family and on this occasion he declared that he should soon begin the *Gospels* with his son Charles. 'It is very obvious,' he told Warter, 'that old Icelandic, like the old Anglo-Saxon and the old Welsh, is so difficult as often to perplex the best scholars; and it is equally obvious that this must arise from the extreme rudeness of these languages in their early stages.' He proceeded at once to go through the third volume of the *Edda* and commented on the views of Finn Magnusen, of whose following the system of Count de Gebelin he disapproved. 'To me it appears that the system is only true in part; against it is the extent to which they carry it.... The Land of Allegory and the Land of Etymology both border upon Milton's Limbo, and many lost wits take their flight from them.... Nevertheless, I have a great respect for Finn Magnusen, and am grateful to him for his labours.' There are other echoes of these Icelandic studies in Southey's correspondence. He began playfully to address his daughter Edith as Thrym and continued to do so from February 14, 1828, down to November 2, 1830, while he signed himself 'Your affectionate father, Abu-Thrym,' as late as October 18, 1831. Moreover, on July 28, 1830, describing to Warter how his cousin Edward had set out to meet Lord Selkirk at Penrith, he wrote: 'They are armed with hammers, because of which weapon and the dreadful manner in

¹ It will be seen that Scott misquotes.

² *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, p. 346.

³ *Ibid.*, III, p. 334.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 258. According to Warter (III, p. 334) he sent it to Southey in 1828, but in that case it apparently did not reach him.

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 352.

which he employed it, the said Edward is now called Thor. Look at Thrym's "Quida" in the first volume of the "Edda" (p. 182) and you will find a story of "Thor and his Hammer" which is well worth reading¹. Perhaps he hoped to make some use of the *Edda* in *The Doctor*; at any rate in his notes he set aside one such passage for that purpose².

Southey found his Icelandic knowledge of service when he came to write the first volume of his *Lives of the British Admirals* in 1833. It is evident that he relied to a large extent on Latin translations and on the histories of Danish and Swedish writers, but even his nodding acquaintance with Icelandic sources placed him in a stronger position for the treatment of the subject than previous English historians³. By one means or another, he was enabled to form an estimate of the Viking character, which is notable as a vivid picture of their vices and virtues and also as an exposition of Southey's own views on war. He compares the Vikings to the buccaneers on the Spanish Main in the seventeenth century:

Like them, they were the bravest and most inhuman of mankind. But the age in which they lived, and the institutions in which they were trained up, are to be regarded, and it will then appear that the difference between them in wickedness is great indeed. The state of nature is not a state of war, though erring philosophers have so represented it; but false religions and barbarising customs have rendered it so from the earliest times after the dispersion of mankind, always in the uncivilised parts of the world, and too generally in those where civilisation has taken root and flourished. Before the north of Europe was converted to Christianity, all free men were considered there to be as certainly and properly born for war, as sheep and oxen are reared for slaughter. With all the infinite variety of individual dispositions, collective men are, nevertheless, like clay in the potter's hand; they receive the stamp of their age and country, and it is in iron ages that the deepest impress is produced. The law of nations being then nothing but the law of the strongest, no country could be at peace, unless it were able at all times to resist all invaders; and none could at any time be secure, because all were always exercising themselves in war. The Vikingr in those days were the Arabs of the sea; their hand was against every man, and every man's hand was against them; their world was in a state of warfare; all men were common enemies, those alone excepted who were united in friendship by some special tie; and they only did to others what others would have done to them. When we see what men are, in the most enlightened and Christian countries, living under good laws, and in the profession of a religion which was proclaimed with peace on earth, good will towards men, and by the due observance of which peace on earth might be established, and peace of mind here as well as endless happiness hereafter would become the assured portion of every one who accepts the proffered salvation, can we wonder at the worse than brutal condition to which our

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, iv, p. 192.

² A quotation from *Hávarðál* in Latin and Icelandic in *Commonplace Book*, iv, p. 471.

³ As his footnotes show, the chief works which he consulted were: *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, William of Malmesbury's *History*, Selden's notes on Drayton's *Polyolbion*, Percy's *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry*, Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*, Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Olaus Magnus' *History of the Goths, Swedes, and Vandals*, Pontanus' *Rerum Danicarum Historia*, Stephanus Stephanus' commentary on Saxo Grammaticus, Holberg's *Dannemarks Riges Historie* and Johnstone's *Antiquitates Cello-Scandicae*. For the elucidation of some points he also drew on Johann Ihre's *Glossarium Suiogothicum*.

fellow-creatures may be brought by institutions which, instead of seeking to repress the evil propensities of human nature, are designed for exciting them to the strongest action?

Southey emphasises the cruelty of the Vikings. They showed neither mercy nor generosity and wherever they landed, they left a trail of fire and blood:

There have been fouler and bloodier superstitions than that of the Scandinavians; but none, either among earlier or later idolatries, that has produced so great a degree of national ferocity; none that has ever made war the great and all-absorbing business of life, and represented the souls of the happy in paradise as cutting each other every day to pieces for amusement, and assembling after such pastime, when heads and dis severed limbs were reunited, to drink together out of the skulls of their enemies.

But Southey sees in them some redeeming qualities—the willingness to submit to severe discipline, skill and daring as sailors, enterprise, and, above all, courage.

Not unnaturally, Southey was on the alert for any traces which the Vikings had left behind them. When on a journey from Ilfracombe to Lynmouth in 1799, he recalled the great struggle at Kenwith Castle but for which the efforts of Alfred might have been fruitless and the course of English history changed¹. He noted also the numerous vestiges of the Vikings in the Lake District² as well as the remains of their burial mounds in Denmark, Norway and Iceland³.

With modern Denmark Southey was in some ways in closer contact than with any of the other Scandinavian countries. For one thing he exchanged courtesies with the most distinguished of contemporary Danish writers. Oehlenschläger, who had read with patriotic satisfaction Southey's tribute to the courage of the Danes at the battle of Copenhagen in his *Life of Nelson*, sent him some of his works, and so did Ingemann. Their kindness was returned by Southey in 1830 when his son-in-law Warter, who had been ordained as chaplain to the British Embassy at Copenhagen, presented the two poets with copies of *All for Love* and *A Tale of Paraguay*. On August 29 of that year, Ingemann wrote to Grundtvig just before his journey to England and said: 'If you should see the poet Southey, greet him from me and thank him for the time being for the poems recently sent me; when I get to know his address, I will send him my old *Valdemar*⁴.' Evidently Southey was interested in

¹ *Commonplace Book*, IV, p. 520.

² *Letters*, ed. Warter, IV, p. 281.

³ Extracts from Pinkerton's *Literary Correspondence* in *Commonplace Book*, III, pp. 544–5.

⁴ *Valdemar den Store og hans Mænd*, published in 1824. There is no record of a meeting between Grundtvig and Southey in 1830, but in 1843 Grundtvig visited Keswick. Southey's house, as he saw it, empty and neglected on a resplendent summer morning, made a deep impression on him. He roamed alone about the garden, where the flowers were nearly choked by the rank weeds, and down the narrow path to the rushing river, with the black

Oehlenschläger, for among the books with which Warter supplied him was a life of the Danish poet and it was read of an evening in the family circle at Keswick. This implies, as do some of the works consulted by Southey when writing the *Lives of the British Admirals*, a knowledge of Danish on his part. He began to acquire it in the summer of 1822 and made good progress, so that by the end of 1824 he could read plain prose with some facility, the only obstacle which he found being the copious vocabulary, as his memory by this time was no longer so retentive. He communicated his impressions of the language to Warter in a letter dated March 18, 1830:

You are going to a country which has more in its history and literature to recommend it than in all its objects of art or nature. But to an Englishman it is a very interesting land, and the language of all others most akin to our own, and consequently easier than any other foreign one whatever. You will readily acquire it, and find the value of the acquisition, as an aid towards other northern tongues, and an indispensable step towards a lexicographical knowledge of our own.

Southey maintained that there was much sound learning in Denmark, and he contrasted the enlightened support which was lent to such scholars as Finn Magnussen with the neglect of literature by the government in England. In his opinion, which was somewhat coloured by his anti-French and anti-Catholic sentiments, the literature of the northern nations was at that time far in advance of that created in the south. 'The Goths, who overthrew the Roman empire, were not superior in a greater degree to the Romans whom they subdued than the Northerners are now in literature to anything that the South produces as long as Italy is blasted by the Papal Upas.' He therefore urged Warter to explore these new and fertile regions. Another point to which Warter's attention was directed was the history of the Reformation and the state of the Church in Denmark and Sweden. 'In those countries,' wrote Southey, 'the work was more effectually done than anywhere else, and therefore it should seem, more wisely. The Romanists have never recovered strength there; nor have any sects acquired head enough to be troublesome.' He suggested that Warter might sketch a paper on this theme for the *Quarterly Review* or *The British Critic* and, if he found pleasure in it, afterwards make it into a volume. 'This might lead you at

mountains of Cumberland in the background. At the thought of all the life that had flourished there, his heart was touched, and he felt that we die a double death if no kindred spirit returns to the spots where we have wandered. Grundtvig bore away from Keswick far more vivid memories than from Abbotsford, where an old woman disturbed him with her chatter about its former master (cf. F. L. Grundtvig, *Grundtvigs Brev fra England til Dronning Karoline Amalie*. Særtryk af *Danskeren*, 1891, pp. 18 and 21). He wrote a poem of six stanzas entitled *Southey's Hus i Keswick*, and although it possesses no great merit, it is interesting as a tribute to Southey (cf. Grundtvig, *Poetiske Skrifter*, udg. af Svend Grundtvig, VI, pp. 468-9).

length to meditate a history of the three Scandinavian kingdoms—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—a singularly rich subject, having in its early periods an English interest; a romantic one in its middle, and even later ages; and a moral and political one, in a high degree, at last.’

It is clear that in various ways Southey envied Warter the opportunity of visiting Denmark. There were so many matters on which he had sought information in vain. There was no work later than Molesworth’s *Account of Denmark in 1692* which gave him satisfaction, and even that was inadequate. William Coxe’s *Travels* were dry and dull, ‘giving only the *caput mortuum* of what information he had gathered, which was generally from the most accessible authorities, when it did not consist of statistic details,’ and the later travellers had much less to say of Denmark than of Sweden. Among the questions which perplexed Southey was why Denmark should be such a poor country, the people being diligent and the government neither oppressive nor wasteful. In the end he concluded that it only needed something to invigorate industry, whereas England in these years before the Reform Bill seemed to him in a much more precarious condition. However this might be, Southey felt that Warter ought to lose no chance of preserving his observations, and he urged the importance of a detailed record. ‘Do not think anything which relates to the manners or appearance—the in- or out-of-door nature—of a foreign country, unworthy of noticing in your journal or note-book. At your age I was satisfied with two or three lines of memoranda, when the same objects would now give me good matter for perhaps as many pages¹.’ Seven weeks later he repeated his admonition: ‘Learn all that you can, by help of eyes and ears, about the country, and note down all you see and all you hear. Nothing is beneath one’s notice in a foreign country².’

One book which contained the curious information dear to Southey’s heart was Thiele’s *Danske Folkesagn*. He was therefore especially pleased when Warter in 1830 sent him the part which he lacked to make his set complete, and the following year he was busy reading it with his son Charles. This collection of popular traditions made him wish that a similar work had been compiled in England fifty years earlier, before so many traditions had perished. He thought, however, that something might still be saved, and so on February 6, 1832, he wrote to Mrs Bray of Tavistock as follows:

Gather up all the traditions you can, and even the nursery songs; no one can tell of what value they may prove to an antiquary. The Danes have a collection of such

¹ *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vi, pp. 106–7, and Warter, *Letters*, iv, p. 191.

² *Letters*, ed. Warter, iv, p. 191.

traditions in two volumes—every local story, wise or silly, that could be collected, and a very curious book it is; my son and I are just coming to the end of it in our lessons. There is matter enough in such things for fancy and for reflection to point a moral or work up into a poem, and not unfrequently to elucidate something in the history of former time¹.

Among other traditions the collection contains the story of *The Forsaken Merman*, which in some way or other came to Matthew Arnold's notice, but the one tale which Southey singles out for comment is that of *The Church Lamb*. It seems that in olden days when a church was built it was the custom to bury a lamb alive under the altar, so that the building might remain immovable. According to Danish tradition, it was often possible for anyone entering the church outside the hours of worship to see the lamb run across the floor, and when a child was about to die, the church lamb was wont to dance on the threshold of the house². This superstition Southey considered very remarkable, adding that 'it looks very much as if there had been a mingling of heathenish rites with Christianity, and a literal sacrifice of a lamb at the foundation of a church³.'

Although Southey sought to familiarise himself with Danish literature⁴ and with Danish traditions, he made little use of this knowledge, apart from a jotting here and there in *Omniana* and *The Doctor*⁵. He was, however, brought into vital contact with Denmark when, in writing the *Life of Nelson*, he had to describe the battle of Copenhagen. The book was an expansion of a review in the *Quarterly* for February, 1810, and in his account of the operations against Denmark in 1801 Southey relied more especially on two of the books which he had discussed. These were the biographies of John Charnock and Clarke and McArthur. With their aid and that of *The Naval Chronicle* he was able to build up a sound, though not entirely accurate, narrative. But he was not content with these authorities; he ransacked all his books to get the scene clearly before his eyes. For the striking description of the Sound which

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, iv, p. 260.

² Thiele, I, pp. 136-7.

³ *Letters*, ed. Warter, iv, p. 190.

⁴ He told Warter in 1822 that he had obtained a *Bibliotheca Danica*, by which Warter understood him to mean the *Litteratur-Lexicon* of Nyerup and Kraft.

⁵ *The Doctor*, p. 106, quotes Molesworth's *Account of Denmark*; in *Omniana*, I, p. 327, Southey draws on Saxo Grammaticus and *ibid.*, II, p. 107 he alludes to Macdonald's *Travels in Denmark*. Other references occurring in Southey's notes or letters are these: Molesworth in *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, p. 243 and in *Commonplace Book*, II, pp. 594-5 and IV, p. 353; Aitzema's *Saken van Staet en Oorlogh* in *Commonplace Book*, III, p. 312; Feldborg's *Tour in Zealand*, *ibid.*, II, p. 353; Clarke's *Travels*, *ibid.*, III, p. 791; Thiele's *Danske Folketsagn*, *ibid.*, IV, p. 709; Pinkerton's *Literary Correspondence*, *ibid.*, III, pp. 544 and 545; Sir John Sinclair's *Correspondence*, *ibid.*, III, p. 553; Fosbrooke's *History of Berkeley*, *ibid.*, III, p. 613; Nicolas Heming's *Postil upon the Gospels*, *ibid.*, III, p. 118; Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, *ibid.*, I, p. 265; Verstegan, *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, *ibid.*, II, p. 317. Further notes on Danish matters will be found in *Commonplace Book*, II, pp. 327-8, III, pp. 555-6 and IV, pp. 412, 433, 508 and 683.

precedes the battle his chief source was William Coxe's *Travels into Poland, Russia, Sweden and Denmark*, whence he also drew the story of Queen Matilda's imprisonment in the castle of Elsinore. To Sir John Carr's *A Northern Summer* he owed the anecdote of the reply made by the Danish Crown Prince when Nelson praised the conduct of Peter Villemoes and declared that he ought to be made an admiral. The prince's answer ran: 'If, my lord, I am to make all my brave officers admirals, I should have no captains or lieutenants in my service.' It was in this work that Southey also learnt of the Danish writer who claimed that Nelson, to judge by his name, must be of Danish descent and that therefore his actions were attributable to Danish valour. The Danish point of view was indeed familiar to Southey, more particularly through a book published in 1805 by a Dane, Andreas Andersen Feldborg. It was entitled *A Tour in Zealand, in the Year 1802; with an Historical Sketch of the Battle of Copenhagen. By a Native of Denmark*, and was widely read in England. Southey made considerable use of Feldborg's account. Through it he was enabled to describe the suspense with which the Danes awaited the attack, the patriotic ardour of the university and the zeal with which the defence was carried on by soldiers, sailors and citizens alike. By this means he also drew a more detailed and a more faithful picture of the course of the battle, and Southey likewise followed Feldborg in preference to the British account of Carr when describing the reception accorded to Nelson by the crowd on his landing¹. Finally, he learnt from Feldborg of the enthusiasm displayed by the Danes in relieving the wounded, in honouring the dead and in commemorating the courage of their countrymen in music, painting and poetry.

However, Southey had other important sources of information which lent animation and precision to his picture of the action. He speaks of 'Brierley's chart' standing him in good stead², and this Brierley was presumably the master of the *Bellona* in which Southey's brother Thomas served as a lieutenant and was wounded during the battle. Realising the value of such an eye-witness, Southey repeatedly wrote to beg Thomas for recollections and explanations.

You used to speak of the dead lying in shoal water at Copenhagen; there was the boatswain's mate, or somebody, asked for, when he was lying face upward under the

¹ Carr says: 'He calmly descended from the carriage amidst the murmurs and groans of the enraged concourse, which not even the presence of the Danish officers who accompanied him could restrain.' Feldborg says: 'On his landing, he was received by the people without either acclamations or murmurs; they did not degrade themselves with the former, nor disgrace themselves with the latter. The Admiral was received as one brave enemy ever ought to receive another—he was received with respect.'

² *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, p. 312.

stern or somewhere. Tell me the right particulars of this... What was your loss? Tell me all about your guns, and what loss they occasioned. Were they not honey-combed? Were you not saying when you pulled the triggers, 'Here goes the death of six!' This is a thing which would be felt.

In the same letter he said: 'I have touched your old tyrant, Sir Thomas, gently, but upon the sore place; imputing no blame, but stating every circumstance which makes misconduct an (almost) unavoidable inference¹.' In view of these passages, it is easy to see what was Southey's source of information for the following:

Both in the *Bellona* and the *Isis* many men were lost by the bursting of their guns. The former ship was about forty years old, and these guns were believed to be the same which she had first taken to sea: they were, probably, originally faulty, for the fragments were full of little air-holes. The *Bellona* lost seventy-five men... The *Bellona*, Sir Thomas Boulden Thompson, kept too close on the starboard shoal, and grounded abreast of the outer ship of the enemy: this was the more vexatious, inasmuch as the wind was fair, the room ample, and three ships had led the way. The *Russell*, following the *Bellona*, grounded in like manner: both were within reach of shot; but their absence from their intended stations was severely felt.

There were other sailors from whose lips Southey heard of the events at Copenhagen. Among these was Captain Guillem, an old salt who had risen from before the mast and been present at Copenhagen and Trafalgar. In November, 1807, he visited Thomas Southey at Keswick, and to an appreciative audience spun long yarns about Nelson, whose first-lieutenant he had been². Two other friends of Southey whose reminiscences he used were Lintham and Ponsonby, and he took care to walk over and consult the latter about corrections and amplifications of his account of the battle³.

It must have been from one of these oral sources that he derived his knowledge of an incident which he included in his article in the *Quarterly*⁴ and afterwards embodied in his *Life of Nelson*.

When the fleet sailed, it was sufficiently known that its destination was against Copenhagen: some Danish sailors, who were on board the *Amazon* frigate, went to Captain Riou, and requested that he would get them exchanged into a ship bound on some other service; 'they had no wish,' they said, 'to quit the British navy, but they intreated that they might not be led to fight against their own country.' There was not in our whole navy a man who had a higher and more chivalrous sense of honour and duty than Riou. The tears came into his eyes while the men were addressing him; he ordered his boat instantly, and did not return to the *Amazon* till he had procured their exchange.

This sympathetic attitude towards the Danes was shared by Nelson himself. Finding that some surrendered Danish ships lay under a murderous cross-fire from the batteries on shore and the British men-of-

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, pp. 315-16.

² *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, III, p. 120.

³ *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, p. 315.

⁴ Southey stated (*Quarterly Review*, III, p. 254) that this anecdote had never before been made public.

war, he proposed a truce to prevent such a massacre of helpless men, for, as he said: 'The brave Danes are the brothers, and should never be the enemies of the English.' This generosity of spirit was recognised by the Danes, and Major-General Lindholm wrote to Nelson: 'As to your lordship's motive for sending a flag of truce, it never can be misconstrued; and your subsequent conduct has sufficiently shown that humanity is always the companion of true valour. You have done more; you have shown yourself a friend to the re-establishment of peace and good harmony between this country and Great Britain.' Southey followed this lead, and, as has been seen, sought to lend greater impartiality to his narrative by studying the Danish account of the battle. He was liberal in his tributes to the courage and devotion of the Danes and took pains to emphasise Nelson's conciliatory attitude: 'The Danes were an honourable foe; they were of English mould as well as English blood; and now that the battle had ceased, he regarded them rather as brethren than enemies.' There can be no doubt that Southey's presentation of the battle in this manner awakened an echo in many Danish hearts, as it did in that of Oehlenschläger.

In making this attempt to restore harmony, Southey was guided by his own inclinations. While he recognised that 'Denmark was French at heart: ready to co-operate in all the views of France, to recognise all her usurpations and obey all her injunctions,' and while he regretted that Danish courage had been made subservient to the interests of France, the Danes did not on that account forfeit his respect. Nor did he deny them his sympathy in 1807, when Canning, fearing lest the Danish navy should be used by Napoleon against England, called upon neutral Denmark to give it up, and to enforce this demand ordered the bombardment of Copenhagen by a British fleet. Coleridge justified this action because of the supposed hostile intentions of the Danes, but Wordsworth agreed with Southey in condemning it¹. No one could be more bitterly opposed to France than Southey, but he refused to let his sense of justice be swayed by blind passion. 'You know,' he told Miss Barker,

how little I have ever feared the power of France, and what my feelings have been concerning invasion. They are changed since this atrocious business. My faith was in God, and in a good cause, as much as in our human power. But now that we have laid that aside, that we have foregone the vantage-ground on which we stood, put ourselves on a level with Bonaparte, and voluntarily chosen to fight him with his own weapons of cruelty, and tyranny, and injustice,—inasmuch as I believe in God's retributive justice, so do I fear for what may be the fate of this country.... Woe be to the nation, and to the individual who believes that anything which is wrong can ever be expedient².

¹ *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, III, p. 141.

² *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, pp. 25-6.

Highly as Southey esteemed the Danes, he did not think less of the Swedes. Indeed he calls the Swedish peasantry 'the best of the Scandinavians—a fine, brave, uncorrupted people.' Evidently the traditional independence of the Dalecarlians had impressed him, for he remarks that it is their privilege to shake hands with the King¹. As he learnt Danish, so he learnt Swedish, using for this purpose the Swedish version of the Bible, which he and his son were reading in 1831. He tried also to acquire a knowledge of Swedish literature, but was handicapped for want of something more recent than Scheffer's *Suecia Literata*. There was one older Swedish writer, however, with whose work he was familiar and that was Olaus Magnus. In addition to relying on his authority when preparing the *Lives of the British Admirals*², Southey drew upon him for *The Doctor*³, and his *Commonplace Book* contains other references to him⁴. On the other hand he denied that his ballad *The Old Woman of Berkeley* was in any way indebted to Olaus Magnus⁵.

Above all, however, Southey gave his attention to the great Swedish kings. He thought of Sweden as a country fruitful in splendid and memorable events, fortunate in the most romantic of histories, in the centre of which stood Gustavus Adolphus and Charles XII. He read closely Harte's *History of Gustavus Adolphus*, noting such facts as indicated his genius. He observed that the King disapproved of corporal punishment, that he clothed his men well and kept them clean and warm, that he banished all disputes concerning rank and priority, and that in his armies promotion depended on merit and seniority only⁶. Elsewhere Southey remarked that the Jesuits introduced religious discipline into the Duke of Parma's army, that Gustavus followed this example, and that in his turn he was imitated by Cromwell⁷. It was just this discipline which struck Southey so forcibly, and he touches on it again and again. Thus in a letter dated March 12, 1813, he says that it was by 'forming his army upon good moral as well as military principles, that Gustavus became the greatest captain of modern times: so he may certainly be called, because he achieved the greatest things with means which were apparently the most inadequate.' In a note to *The Poet's Pilgrimage to Waterloo* also he refers to this matter of discipline. Almost

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, II, p. 204.

² The footnote on p. 44 of this work shows that he used the Basel edition of 1567.

³ Cf. Warter's edition of 1849, p. 366.

⁴ *rv*, pp. 468 and 711.

⁵ Cf. Taylor, *Memoir*, ed. Robberds, I, pp. 233, 235–6, and 238–9; II, p. 106, and the preface to vol. VI of Southey's *Collected Poems*.

⁶ *Commonplace Book*, III, p. 499.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, p. 142 and III, p. 308.

everywhere in Belgium he heard complaints about the Prussians, which led him to exclaim:

And now they felt the Prussian's heavy hand:
 He came to aid them; bravely had he stood
 In their defence; but oh! in peace how ill
 The soldier's deeds, how insolent his will!

If on the other hand he heard the British troops universally extolled, he attributed it to the rigorous discipline which Wellington had imposed only after many years of exertion and severity, and he added that 'the moral discipline of an army has never perhaps been understood by any General, except the great Gustavus.'

For Charles XII Southey did not entertain the same admiration. He clearly regarded him as one whose exploits had wrought great harm. This appears incidentally when, in reviewing Acerbi's *Travels*, he speaks of the great canal at Trollhätta begun by Charles XII and remarks: 'Happy had it been for Sweden, if his mighty enterprizes had been all as useful¹.' Southey's feelings towards Charles are fully revealed in *The Battle of Pultowa*, written in 1798. At that time Southey had still enough of his revolutionary sentiments left to make him hostile to anything that savoured of monarchical tyranny. The treatment of Patkul turned his sympathies against Charles, and so in the outline of the poem which he drew up, he described it as an invective ode, which name it well deserves. It begins, it is true, with a tribute to the courage and determination of Charles and his disregard of self:

Him Famine hath not tamed,
 The tamer of the brave.
 Him Winter hath not quell'd;
 When man by man his veteran troops sunk down,
 Frozen to their endless sleep,
 He held undaunted on.
 Him Pain hath not subdued;
 What though he mounts not now
 The fiery steed of war,
 Borne on a litter to the field he goes.

But then the note changes. For years the haughty, iron-hearted Swede has ridden roughshod over others, but now his stubborn will is about to be thwarted at Pultowa and ruin will come upon him as a punishment for his harshness:

Go, iron-hearted King!
 Full of thy former fame.
 Think how the humbled Dane
 Crouch'd underneath thy sword;
 Think how the wretched Pole
 Resign'd his conquer'd crown;
 Go, iron-hearted King!

¹ *The Annual Review*, I, p. 45.

Let Narva's glory swell thy haughty breast,
 The death-day of thy glory, Charles, hath dawn'd!
 Proud Swede, the Sun hath risen
 That on thy shame shall set!

Now, Patkul, may thine injured spirit rest!
 For over that relentless Swede
 Ruin hath raised his unrelenting arm;
 For ere the night descends,
 His veteran host destroyed,
 His laurels blasted to revive no more,
 He flies before the Moscovite.

Impatiently that haughty heart must bear
 Long years of hope deceived;
 Long years of idleness
 That sleepless soul must brook.

Now, Patkul, may thine injured spirit rest!
 To him who suffers in an honest cause
 No death is ignominious; not on thee,
 But upon Charles, the cruel, the unjust,
 Not upon thee, on him
 The ineffaceable reproach is fix'd,
 The infamy abides.

Now, Patkul, may thine injured spirit rest!

Curious testimony to the deep-rooted animosity of Southey towards Charles XII is to be found long after this poem was written. Southey was in the habit of recording his dreams, and on August 16, 1808, he made this note:

Last night I and the King of Denmark were taken prisoners by Charles XII of Sweden, I having been grievously wounded in the thigh. He was determined to put us to death, and sent for us into his chamber to tell us so. How it happened I know not, but I and my brother of Denmark—for I was as good a king as himself—were not on good terms. However, I helped him to a chair, for he was desperately hurt, and seated myself. And then I gave Charles what I really believe was a very eloquent philippic: the murder of Patkul, I told him, was the crime which had damned him in this world and the next. I stung him to the very heart, and by way of generosity he told us he would put off our execution till one in the morning, and we might go to bed if we pleased. I made answer that with that wound in my thigh and a wife and children in England it was not very likely I should go to sleep, and that if I did, I should not like to get up at one in the morning to be put to death. So the sooner that business was performed the better¹.

The only other Swedish ruler who appears to have interested Southey is Queen Christina, about whom he had read in Priorato and to whose superstitiousness in later years he refers in his *Omniana*². But he was struck by some other outstanding Swedish characters such as St Birgitta³, Linnæus⁴ and Swedenborg. With regard to Swedenborg he preserved

¹ *Correspondence of Robert Southey with Caroline Bowles*, p. 377.

² II, pp. 82-3.

³ Notes from L'Enfant, *Concile de Pise* and *Concile de Constance* in *Commonplace Book*, III, pp. 375 and 378.

⁴ He had read R. Pulteney's *General View of the Writings of Linnæus* and W. Swainson's *Preliminary discourse on the study of natural history* (cf. *Commonplace Book*, III, pp. 507 and 644). He was also familiar with Linnæus' *Tour in Lapland* (cf. *Letters*, ed. Warton, II, pp. 243-4).

among his personal observations and recollections a curious anecdote. One day Gustavus Brander was walking in Cheapside with Swedenborg, when the latter took off his hat and made a very respectful bow. 'Who are you bowing to?' asked Brander. 'You did not see him,' replied Swedenborg. 'It was St Paul, I knew him very well¹.'

In addition to the odds and ends of information about Sweden, which Southey had gathered in his customary pursuit of the curious², he was greatly interested in the descriptions of the country given by modern travellers. Like a true romantic, he was fascinated by their accounts of the vast solitudes of the North, the great rivers, forests, lakes and waterfalls of Sweden, Norway, Lapland and Finland. Even when he was a young man, his imagination had been stirred by Mary Wollstonecraft's *Letters during a residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark*. They appeared in 1796, and he was evidently reading them the following spring, for on April 28 he asked his brother Thomas: 'Have you ever met with Mary Wollstonecraft's letters from Sweden and Norway?' 'She has made me in love with a cold climate,' he went on, 'and frost and snow, with a northern moonlight.' The appeal of the subject was reinforced by the vivid personality of the author and he described the book as 'a delightful work which derives its chief interest from the perpetual presence of the writer³.' In 1795 Southey had dedicated *The Triumph of Woman* to her, and when they met his admiration was redoubled. Her death on November 1, 1797, was therefore a great blow to him, and in the introductory poem which he wrote for Cottle's *Icelandic Poetry* immediately afterwards, he recorded all these emotions—grief, admiration and longing for the northern scenes which she had portrayed:

Methinks

Amid such scenes as these, the Poet's soul
Might best attain its growth; pine-cover'd rocks,
And mountain forests of eternal shade,
And glens and vales, on whose green quietness
The lingering eye reposes, and fair lakes
That image the light foliage of the beech,
Or the grey glitter of the aspen leaves
On the still bough thin trembling. Scenes like these
Have almost lived before me, when I gazed
Upon their fair resemblance traced by him⁴
Who sung the banish'd man of Ardebeil,
Or to the eye of Fancy held by her,
Who among women left no equal mind

¹ *Commonplace Book*, iv, p. 515.

² Cf. *ibid.*, ii, pp. 327–8, and iii, p. 735.

³ See his review of Acervi's *Travels* in *The Annual Review*, i, p. 45.

⁴ Drawings made by Charles Fox of Falmouth during a tour on foot through Norway and Sweden. His *Poems, containing the Complaints, Consolations, and Delights of Achmed Ardebeili* were published by Joseph Cottle in 1797.

When from the world she pass'd; and I could weep,
 To think that *She* is to the grave gone down!
 Were I, my friend, a solitary man,
 Without one tie in life to anchor me,
 I think that I would wander far to view
 Such scenes as these, for they would fill a heart
 That loathes the commerce of this wretched world,
 And sickens at its hollow gaities.
 And sure it were most pleasant when the day
 Was young, to roam along the mountain path,
 And mark the upmost pines, or grey with age,
 Or blue in their first foliage, richly tinged
 With the slant sun-beam, then at fits to pause
 And gaze into the glen, a deep abyss
 Of vapour, whence the unseen torrents roar
 Up-thunder'd. Sweet to walk abroad at night
 When as the summer moon was high in heaven
 And shed a calm clear lustre, such as gave
 The encircling mountains to the eye, distinct,
 Disrobed of all their bright day-borrow'd hues,
 The rocks' huge shadows darker, the glen stream
 Sparkling along its course, and the cool air
 Fill'd with the firs' faint odour¹.

Southey also knew Küttner's *Travels through Denmark, Sweden, Austria, and part of Italy*², Leemius' *De Lapponibus*, Maupertuis' *Voyage au cercle polaire*, William Coxe's *Travels* and Bulstrode Whitelocke's *Journal of the Swedish Embassy*, but to all these he seems to have preferred Acerbi's *Travels through Sweden, Finland, and Lapland to the North Cape*. The length at which he discussed it in *The Annual Review* and the numerous passages which he culled from it afford a clear indication

¹ The above passage is of course a composite picture which treats the details of the original freely, but it is not difficult to trace some of the lines which suggested it. Mary Wollstonecraft repeatedly mentions the aspens and says of beech-woods: 'The airy lightness of their foliage admitting a degree of sunshine, which, giving a transparency to the leaves, exhibited an appearance of freshness and elegance that I had never before remarked, I thought of descriptions of Italian scenery' (*Letters during a Residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark*, p. 119).

Of pines in sunlight she speaks thus: 'I feel myself unequal to the task of conveying an idea of the beauty and elegance of the scene when the spiral tops of the pines are loaded with ripening seed, and the sun gives a glow to their light green tinge, which is changing into purple. . . . The pine and fir woods, left entirely to nature, display an endless variety; and the paths in the wood are not entangled with fallen leaves, which are only interesting whilst they are fluttering between life and death. The grey cobweb-like appearance of the aged pines is a much finer image of decay' (*ibid.*, pp. 173-4).

Moonlight effects are frequently described but the following stands in especially close relation to the lines of Southey: 'The evening was fine, as is usual at this season; and the refreshing odour of the pine woods became more perceptible. . . . Midnight was coming on; yet it might with such propriety have been termed the noon of night, that had Young ever travelled towards the north, I should not have wondered at his becoming enamoured of the moon. But it is not the queen of night alone who reigns here in all her splendor, though the sun, loitering just below the horizon, decks her with a golden tinge from his car, illuminating the cliffs that hide him; the heavens also, of a clear softened blue, throw her forward, and the evening star appears a lesser moon to the naked eye. The huge shadows of the rocks, fringed with firs concentrating the views, without darkening them. . . .' (*ibid.*, pp. 60-1).

² Cf. the account of the falls of Trollhätta in *Commonplace Book*, II, p. 579.

of his interest in these northern regions. In imagination he heard the woodland note of the Swedish shepherd's birchen horn; he traversed dense and gloomy forests whose silence was broken only by a dull report as the bark of the trees burst with the cold; he saw thousands of gigantic pines rent asunder or uprooted and tossed about in confusion by some fierce hurricane; he crossed the noiseless deserts of the frozen sea in a sledge, driving over undulating plains and through icy pyramids, with here and there a yawning crevasse; he walked across frozen waterfalls and was borne over ice-covered rivers where the swift water gleamed green below; he felt with alarm how his sledge sank down through the brittle ice of spring; he watched the wavering flames and torches of the Aurora Borealis light up the midnight sky; he slept in comfort on reindeer moss and camped on islands in sunlit lakes amid the harmony of green and white birches, crystal waters and soft sandy shores¹.

For his knowledge of Norway Southey relied occasionally on Clarke's *Travels*², and he even found a passage in Jeremy Taylor according to which the Norwegians used to complain that they seldom had any wine in their country and that, in any case, it was almost vinegar³. But his great treasure-house of curious information was Pontoppidan's *Natural History of Norway*. In *Omniana* Southey quotes his authority for the Norwegian peasants' belief that the thunder darts down the stones which they call thunderbolts, aiming them at the Trolls, a kind of witch, or infernal spirit of the night, who would otherwise destroy the whole world⁴, and in the same work he alludes to Pontoppidan's wonderful account of the sea-serpent⁵. A note to the ninth book of *Thalaba* recalls another belief of the Norwegians, namely, that the eagle sometimes soaks his wings in water, then covers them with sand and gravel and, flying in the face of a deer, blinds him to all attack. Southey's notes abound in singular matters related by Pontoppidan⁶—a valley so conducive to long life, that old people, growing weary of it, move elsewhere to die; peasants' weddings where the guests buckle themselves together by their belts and fight with their knives till one is mortally

¹ Cf. *Commonplace Book*, I, p. 400; II, pp. 579–80, 601, 610–13, 632–3, and IV, p. 5. Knowing the swiftly fading radiance of a northern summer, Southey appreciated to the full the appropriateness of the following simile in an elegy on a young lady who died soon after her marriage:

Admir'd and lost, just welcom'd and deplor'd,
Cam'st thou, fair nymph, to wake delight and grief;
Like Lapland summers, with each beauty stor'd,
Transient like them, and exquisitely brief?

It is noted in his *Commonplace Book*, IV, pp. 215–16.

² Cf. *Commonplace Book*, I, p. 62.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, p. 211.

³ *Ibid.*, II, p. 207.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, p. 273.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, pp. 580–1 and 624; III, pp. 712–13, and IV, pp. 469, 544, 563, 574 and 594.

wounded, in anticipation of which the wives habitually take their husbands' shrouds with them; a mountain whither a girl is reputed to have been carried off by the subterraneous inhabitants; a stone which, when galloped over on horseback, emits a violent stench; a plant which causes the bones of cattle so to decay that nothing but the bones of other cattle can prevent their death; hares that catch mice, and nightmare lobsters, the tips of their claws a fathom apart, so that no fisherman dare molest them¹.

Southey had encountered reports not less marvellous about Lapland and Finland. He had read of the skill of the witches there in charming the winds² and had heard that the Finns could restore a man who had been drowned two or three days, though such a person found his vivacity abated and his memory impaired³! This reputation of Finland for magic was confirmed by a story which Southey came across in the notes to Thomas Heywood's *Hierarchies of the Blessed Angels*. 'In Finland,' the legend ran,

there is a castle which is called the New Rock, moted about with a riuer of an vnsonded depth, the water blacke, and the fish therein very distastefull to the palat. In this are Spectars often seene, which fore-shew either the death of the Gouvernor, or some prime Officer belonging to the place: and most commonly it appeareth in the shape of an Harper, sweetly singing, and dallying and playing vnder the water⁴.

The same work contained a story of a maiden called Donica,

who after she was dead, the Diuell had walked in her body for the space of two yeares, so that none suspected but that she was still aliue: for she did both speak and eat, though very sparingly; onely she had a deepe palenesse in her countenance, which was the only signe of death. At length a Magition coming by, where she was then in the companie of many other Virgins; as soone as hee beheld her, hee said, Faire Maids, why keep you company with this dead Virgin, whom you suppose to be aliue? When taking away the Magicke charme which was tied vnder her arme, the body fell downe liuelesse and without motion⁵.

Southey combined the two stories in his poem *Donica*, written in 1796. But he introduces a love motive and the tragic death of Donica takes place on her wedding day. The opening stanzas are the most striking, for in them Southey attempts to suggest the uncanny atmosphere of this mysterious lake:

High on a rock whose castle shade
Darken'd the lake below,
In ancient strength majestic stood
The towers of Arlinkow.

¹ In *Commonplace Book*, iv, p. 401, there is another piece of information about Norway, for which Southey does not give his authority.

² *Ibid.*, iv, p. 54, based on Selden's annotations to Drayton's *Polyolbion*.

³ *Ibid.*, iv, p. 553, from Birch, *History of the Royal Society*.

⁴ Edition of 1635, p. 549.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 480.

The fisher in the lake below
 Durst never cast his net,
 Nor ever swallow in its waves
 Her passing wing would wet.
 The cattle from its ominous banks
 In wild alarm would run,
 Though parch'd with thirst, and faint beneath
 The summer's scorching sun.
 For sometimes when no passing breeze
 The long lank sedges waved,
 All white with foam and heaving high
 Its deafening billows raved.
 And when the tempest from its base
 The rooted pine would shake,
 The powerless storm unruffling swept
 Across the calm dead lake.
 And ever then when death drew near
 The house of Arlinkow,
 Its dark unfathom'd waters sent
 Strange music from below.

The survey of Southey's relations with Scandinavia and Finland shows how an early interest was revived and fortified in the twenties and thirties; it illustrates his wide reading, his eagerness in the pursuit of curious lore, and the fertility of his mind in forming literary projects; it bears witness to his love of peace and his hatred of oppression; and it reveals his belief that generosity and fair dealing are not less essential in national and international than in private affairs, and that divine retribution awaits those, whether individuals or peoples, who sacrifice principle to expediency. From our survey there emerges also Southey's respect and admiration for the Scandinavian peoples. If anything, this increased as time passed. During the troublous years preceding the Reform Bill, when Southey felt genuine alarm about the future of England, his thoughts turned to Scandinavia, and in case of danger he wished to take refuge with his family either in Denmark or in Sweden¹. What higher tribute could he have paid to the qualities of the Danes and Swedes²?

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR, NORTH WALES.

¹ On June 9, 1830, he wrote to Warter: 'Two years ago, having occasion to make some inquiry concerning foreign funds, I thought Danish the safest, looking upon the government as safe, and the nation as honourable, and honest, and not likely to be involved in wars or revolutions,' and on June 18, 1831, he told Wynn: 'Wordsworth has invested all the money he could command in the American funds. I am staked down by my books and my employments; but if I were free I would take my family to Denmark or Sweden, as the likeliest places for safety.'

² I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Herr Seminarieförstander Georg Christensen and to Lektor Kjeld Galster for information about Southey's relations with Danish authors. To Mr R. P. Keigwin I am also under a deep obligation for his aid in determining what books Southey used for his description of the battle of Copenhagen. From Lektor J. H. Helweg I have had valuable suggestions in connexion with both these problems.

BUERN BUCECARLE IN 'GAIMAR'

Two rather unusual features are recorded by the *A.S. Chronicle* in its account of the battle of York in 867, which marked the downfall of the old Northumbrian monarchy: for some unknown reason the people had deposed their king, Osbriht, setting up in his place one Ælle, who was not even of royal race, and, after a period of internecine strife, the two had joined forces to meet the common foe and fallen fighting against the Danes in an attempt to recapture their capital, York. For reasons which are not far to seek, the various Latin chronicles lay considerable stress on this reconciliation in face of the invading heathen, but the popular imagination seems rather to have fastened on the deposition. This it related causally to the subsequent conquest: Osbriht is dethroned because of a wrong done to the wife of a subject, Buern Bucecarle, whose friends set up Ælle as king and who, in revenge for his injury, brings in the Danes.

The story has been discussed by several scholars: by Freeman in his *Mythical and Romantic Elements in Early English History* (1871); by Gross in his dissertation on Gaimar (1902) and by his reviewer, Liebermann (*Archiv f. d. Stud. n. Sprachen*, 1903); and, still more recently, by Matter in his *Englische Gründungssagen* (1922), who came to no very definite conclusion as to the origin of the story, but announced his intention of pursuing the investigation on that point. Therefore, except where it has a bearing on my present purpose—the study of Gaimar's treatment of the story—I shall leave that aspect untouched.

As with Haveloc, we first meet with Buern Bucecarle in the *Estoire des Engleis*, from which the story seems to have found its way indirectly into the later *Bruts*. A more independent form is the very condensed one in the *Eulogium*, which is of importance for three reasons: it gives no indication of knowing Gaimar's account¹, it contains features obscured in, or absent from, the *Estoire*, and it is typical of the alternative source from which at a later date *Bromton* drew those particulars which are not derived from Gaimar. Thus it is necessary to modify slightly Matter's statement:

Die Versionen im Brut, im Eulogium und in der Chronik Bromtons gehören zusammen, auch wenn sie sich in der Art der Darstellung stark unterscheiden. Ist

¹ In my edition of *Le Lai d'Haveloc* (p. 63, n. 1), I expressed another opinion which further consideration has led me to modify in respect of this particular section.

Gaimar ihre Quelle? Alle Züge, die von seiner Version abweichen, liessen sich schliesslich erklären, aber da er den Dänenkönig . . . nicht kennt oder wenigstens nicht nennt, müssen wir annehmen, dass entweder eine andere Version Gaimars existiert hat, oder aber, dass eine uns verloren gegangene Darstellung im Spiel ist (*l.c.*, pp. 286-7)—

because *Brut* and *Bromton* are for practical purposes one and the same account—a conflate one, as indicated above.

Since Gaimar is combining the Buern story with the annal in the *A.S. Chronicle*, it is reasonable to suppose that he is more likely to have modified the original story than is the author of *Eulogium*, who had no such preoccupations. Moreover, in one small particular—making Ælle elected by the whole people—the latter seems to preserve an earlier form of the story; at any rate, a change from this to election by Buern's supporters is easier to understand than one in the reverse direction. Therefore, as I know of no reason for supposing a lost version of the *Estoire*, I shall regard the account in *Eulogium* as typical of the form of the story known to Gaimar.

A tabular summary of the story, in the three accounts which immediately concern us, will facilitate discussion.

	GAIMAR	EULOGIUM	BROMTON
1.	Buern Bucecarle, an important man, is guardian of the shore.	Buern,	Bruern Bocard,
2.	In his absence Osbriht violates his wife. [O. visits the house after hunting, is hospitably entertained and makes a pretext for a private interview with the lady.]	In his absence Osbriht violates his wife. [No details.]	In his absence Osbriht violates his wife. [Details as in Gaimar.]
3.	B. returns, finds his wife	changed in looks and mood, and inquires the reason.	
4.	His wife freely relates the cause of the change and is consoled by B., who promises to love her none the less, to avenge the outrage.	to avenge the outrage	to love her none the less, to avenge the outrage.
5.	B. goes to York, renounces homage and then takes counsel with his friends: it is agreed that they shall depose O. and that B. shall bring in the Danes.	B. goes at once to Denmark to seek help.	B. calls a council of his friends, goes to York and renounces homage, and then goes to Denmark to seek help.
6.		Godrik, king of Denmark, rejoices at the occasion to invade England and promises to help B., who is of his kin.	Codrinus, king of Denmark,
7.		Forces are collected and dispatched under the leadership of Yngwar and Ubba.	to invade England and promises to help B., who is of his kin.
8.	Traversing	Holderness, the Danes attack York.	Inguar and Hubbe.
9.	O. is killed and the city captured.	O. goes out of the city to meet the Danes, is killed, and the city captured.	

10. Ælle, who was elected king instead of O. by
 B.'s friends, the whole people, B.'s friends,
 learns of the death of O. and the capture of York.
 [Æ. is enjoying an open-air meal after hunting when a blind man arrives, overhears the king's satisfaction, tells him of the fate of O. and loss of York, and foretells the deaths of king and nephew in a battle at York, which prophecy is fulfilled.] [No details.] [Æ. is enjoying an open-air meal after hunting when someone arrives, overhears the king's satisfaction, tells him of the fate of O. and loss of York.]
11. Æ. collects his forces, goes to York, whence the Danes come
 out to meet him and give battle in
 a place called Ellecroft. a field called Ellecroft. a place called Ellescroft.

It is evident that the narrative just summarised falls into two parts, viz. (a) points 1-9 and (b) points 10-11, which are connected only by their relation to history, and that our three texts are in much closer agreement in the former, which tells of the vengeance of Buern, than in the latter, which tells of the death of Ælle. In the speed with which Ælle, learning Osbriht's fate, collects forces to meet the Danes, we seem to have a faded memory of the historical reconciliation of the two kings, and in the battle, which is quite definitely linked to a particular place, there is possibly preserved the record of an otherwise unremembered local engagement. I do not think that the author of *Eulogium* knew any more about the death of Ælle than he actually relates, but one phrase in particular: 'Buern vero de mari veniente videns vultum uxoris suæ in mœstitia et tristitia conversum, quod ante illud jocunditatem et hilaritatem sibi ostendebat, ultra modum mirabatur et causam diligenter quæsivit,' suggests that for the Buern story he had before him not only a fuller account but one cast in a distinctly literary form. I think that the two parts of our narrative were already connected when Gaimar came across them, though even more disparate in length and detail than in *Eulogium*, and that Gaimar, in order to reduce this disparity, added to the somewhat meagre details of the second part the story of the blind man and the nephew which he had learnt from some entirely different source. This latter question, though interesting and important in itself, is not germane to my present subject; therefore I leave it undiscussed and now confine my attention strictly to the Buern story proper, i.e. the first part of the above summary.

In the course of his translation of the *A.S. Chronicle*, Gaimar arrived at the entry s.a. 866: 'And py ilcan geare com mycel here on Angelcynnesland ȝ wintersetle namon æt East Englum ȝ ȝær gehorsade

wurdon ȝ hi heom wið frið genamon.' Of this he gives the substance in vv. 2569-76, transposing the last two clauses of the annal in order to secure a better transition to what follows. The next entry began: 'Her for se here of East Englum ofer Humbran muðan to Eoferwicceastre on Norðanhymbre'; and went on to relate the dissensions in Northumbria. Gaimar, by his knowledge of the Buern story, found himself in the happy position of being able to throw further light on those troubles and to gratify his delight in telling a story, but was confronted at the outset by a rather difficult problem. His old source had already told him of repeated Danish invasions; it had just told him of a fresh Danish invasion of East Anglia and of an attack on Northumbria from that base. His new source tells him that Buern in his wrath went post haste to Denmark to invite the Danes to attack Northumbria. Clearly some modification is necessary in order to fit the Buern story into the narrative of the *Estoire*, and it will not be surprising if the attempt is only partly successful.

Gross, after pointing out the ambiguous meaning of *faran* (movement by land or by water) and deciding, rightly, in favour of the former in the annal under discussion, continues: 'Gaimar scheint auch nicht gewusst zu haben, für welche Bedeutung von *faran* . . . er sich entscheiden sollte; er hat sich daher frischweg für beides entschieden, indem er die Dänen sich in zwei Abteilungen teilen lässt' (*l.c.*, p. 91). This conclusion is false for two reasons: firstly, it ignores the fact that Gaimar quite definitely understood *faran* to refer to a land movement; secondly, it leaves out of account the necessity for an invasion by sea inherent in the Buern story. As Earle long ago pointed out, the Danes actually converted their forces into 'mounted infantry,' but Gaimar naturally envisages the matter from the point of view of feudal military organisation and this explains the division of a land force into horse: 'Idonc se mistrent a chival Li plus preise de lur vassal' (vv. 2575-6)—and foot: 'A pie en vunt [*ed. vait*] plus de vint mile' (v. 2579). Further, the Buern story requires an attack by way of Holderness, and Gaimar supplies the necessary troops by taking his land force across the Humber at Grimsby (vv. 2581-3). In this connexion an earlier episode in the *Estoire* deserves mention. As the result of a misunderstanding Gaimar transforms the historical sack of Lindisfarne (A.D. 793) into a ravaging of Lindsey and continues:

Les paens ne se targerent mie.
Quant ourent guaste Lindeseie,
Amunt Humbre alerent siglant
Desci k'en Use e puis avant [*ed. en vont*]
En la buche de Don...

(vv. 2183-7).

This rather suggests that Gaimar was aware of the different nature of the earlier and the later Danish incursions, and shows the route by which, in his opinion, a maritime attack on York would best be carried out. Nor is it without interest that at a later date Tostig and Harald Hardrada follow the same route up the Ouse:

Tant ont nage e tant sigle
K'el flum de Humbre sunt entre,
De Humbre en Use en sunt venuz,
A Saint Wlfrei des nefz eissuz

(vv. 5207-10)—

coming ashore in the very same neighbourhood as the Danes who come to Buern's assistance¹. The movement by land from East Anglia to York is thus coherently, if unhistorically, explained by Gaimar and once the sea force reaches the Humber its course, too, is clear; but whence did it come? The first reference to it is in vv. 2577-8, where we are bound to conclude that it represents the fleet which had arrived in East Anglia the previous year. Then comes another suggestion: Gaimar tells how the ships were stranded by the tide and how the leaders went ashore and were entertained by Buern, who 'les out ainz assemblez E de Denemarche amenez' (vv. 2601-2). This is later forgotten when Gaimar tells of Buern's decision 'k'il s'en irrat, S'il pout, les Daneis amerrat' (vv. 2693-4); making no further reference to Denmark, he simply says: 'Cil out les Daneis amenez' (v. 2704). Thus, by leaving it uncertain whether the fleet (v. 2569) was brought by Buern or not, Gaimar avoids a direct contradiction in his story, but not a slight weakness in his construction. Nevertheless the care taken in combining the two sources shows quite clearly that both were available to him when he reached this point in his *Estoire*.

Although it is probable, from the scanty evidence available, that Gaimar had a written source for his Buern story, he made no attempt to translate it in the way he did the *A.S. Chronicle*; one cannot, in fact, read his version without being aware of a freedom from restraint, in pleasant contrast to the cramped effect of the drier patches of his *Estoire*. For the time being he ceases to be the annalist; he is attempting literature, on the whole successfully.

He makes use of conscious literary artifice: 'Atant es [ed. e] vus le rei venu' (v. 2619) heralds the unexpected arrival of Osbriht; 'Atant es vus Buern, sis marriz' (v. 2641) announces the return of the absent

¹ According to Gaimar, Buern's residence is at Cawood (cf. v. 2705 in conjunction with vv. 2593 ff.). This is just across the river from Riccal, which Florence of Worcester gives as the landing place of Tostig and Harald.

husband. Still more clearly in another example. The wife, in telling her husband what has happened, uses the phrase:

Par force fist sa felunie.
Ore est dreiz ke perde la vie (vv. 2659-60);

the husband, in telling his wife what he proposes to do, echoes:

Si li fels fist sa felunie
Jo querrai k'il perdrat la vie (vv. 2675-6).

He adds picturesque details: Buern guards the shore against outlaws, Osbriht is out hunting when he calls at the house of the absent Buern, Ælle has been following the chase when he learns of the capture of York. We are reasonably certain that this is Gaimar's handiwork, because he uses the same motives in other episodes of his *Estoire*.

He introduces direct speech as much as possible: the exact words Osbriht uses to get the lady by herself, the conversation between husband and wife after the outrage, the defiance of the king and renunciation of homage by Buern. Again, we may safely attribute this feature to Gaimar because it is in full accord with his practice throughout the *Estoire*.

Equally successful is his characterisation. Osbriht, the villain of the piece, comes in Buern's absence to his house, but only gradually does Gaimar reveal that the visit is intentional: first we learn that the king has heard of the lady's beauty; then, after his request for an interview, that all leave the room save two who keep the door: 'Cil erent compaignon le rei Bien saveient tut [*ed. sevent*] son segrei' (vv. 2627-8). Not till the very last is the full depravity of the king and the moral corruption of his court revealed: 'quant il est od ses privez Par mainte faiz s'en est gabez' (vv. 2635-6)!

The nameless wife is living quietly at home, 'cum draiz esteit' (v. 2617), in her husband's absence; unexpectedly the king arrives and quite unsuspectingly ('De malveiste talent n'aveit,' v. 2618) she welcomes him 'par grant honur' (v. 2620). She accedes to his request for an interview, but 'pas n'apardeveit Pur quei li reis ico fesait' (vv. 2629-30). Osbriht 'la prist, estre son gre, De lui ad fait sa volunte' (vv. 2631-2) and 'la dame mult s'en adulat De la honte' (vv. 2637-8). How great the grief was, is shown by the change the husband finds on his return. He sees 'sa femme enpalie E veit la feble e enmegrie E tote estrange la trovat De si [*ed. issi*] com ert quant la leissat' (vv. 2647-50). It is shown, too, by the implied contrast with his usual welcome. Much concerned, he asks the reason; gravely and frankly she tells him all; then 'pasmee chet a ses piez jus' (v. 2664).

Buern, we are told, has a responsible position and, we infer, fills it conscientiously. After one of his periodical turns of duty, he returns home to find himself confronted with an unusual situation. He asks 'que co deveit Ke co espelt [*ed. esplet*] e k'elle aveit' (vv. 2651-2), and the triple repetition emphasises his evident anxiety. Carefully he listens to his wife's explanation and, seeing her at his feet, tenderly reassures her: 'Levez, amie, Pur co ne serrez pas haïe' (vv. 2665-6); then he tells her of his intention to exact vengeance. When, next day, he proceeds to the court, renounces his homage and holds a council of his friends, we are not surprised that they rally round him, for he has indeed shown us that 'mult ert nobles e gentilz' (v. 2642).

These are not the only ways in which Gaimar has stamped his own imprint on the story; he has also added to it a moral significance. Buern's desire to avenge the insult to himself is natural and is inherent in the story, but the stress laid on the wife's frank confession and on the confidence between husband and wife is Gaimar's own contribution. It is a theme which appears to have interested him greatly, for this mutual confidence is implicit in the relation of Haveloc and Argentille, his wife, and later, in his version of the Edgar-Ælföryð story, it is the absence of this confidence on the part of the husband which justifies, for Gaimar, the withdrawal of the wife's affection and excuses her subsequent marriage to the king.

It is now evident how active Gaimar was in refashioning this story which had come to his hand, and it is of the utmost importance to keep this fact in view in any attempt to reconstruct his source or to trace the origin of the story.

ALEXANDER BELL.

PETERBOROUGH.

THE ORIGIN OF THE 'COSSANTES'

WILD flowers are persistent things. Man's systems and philosophies rise and crumble away: the flowers remain, stubbornly proclaiming that God is God. Gissing foretold that modern civilisation would end by levelling the snow mountains; but even so some mountain gentian or rock rose will surely reappear in unexpected places. The swallow survives even the statue which 'survit à la cité':

Tous les ans j'y vais et je niche
aux Métopes du Parthénon.

In much the same way the primitive *cantigas de amigo*, and especially the parallel-strophed *cantigas de amigo*, which we now know as *cossantes* (a distinctive name for a most distinctive *genre*, although the Portuguese fight shy of the word), appear still rooted firmly in the soil of Galicia, in spite of valiant efforts made to uproot them. M. Alfred Jeanroy claimed them for France, and Don Julián Ribera has sought for them an Arabic ancestry. M. Jeanroy later modified his claims that the Galician and Portuguese poets of the thirteenth century had merely borrowed 'et fait fleurir chez eux des genres alors vieillis chez nous,' 'certaines formes qui en France commençaient à vieillir et qu'ils ont fait refleurir en les transplantant dans un sol vierge¹,' and admitted that the Galician imitators of Provençal poetry had turned their attention to certain primitive forms not derived from Provence.

Professor Rodrigues Lapa devotes a chapter of his penetrating study, *Das origens da poesia lírica em Portugal na Idade-Média* (Lisboa, 1929), to discussion of Arabic influence (pp. 13-50). He notes with natural interest the importance of the Galicians in Andalucía during the Moorish domination, and that many of the *Cantigas de Santa Maria* of Alfonso the Learned are constructed on the model of the Arabic *zejel* (which does not prevent it from being true that they derive fundamentally from the 'Grundlage einer heimischen galicischen Poesie²'). Equally naturally he rejects the adventurous derivation of *segrel* from *zejel*. In the *Boosco Delleytoso*, published in 1515 but written perhaps a century earlier, *segre* = *saeculum* (*seculo*)³. But chiefly he rejects the popular character of Ibn Cuzman's poetry:

Todo o erro está em supôr, cremos nós, que êsse lirismo do poeta cordobês representa, dalgum modo, sobretudo no que respeita á forma, o lirismo vulgar românico dos

¹ *Origines de la poésie lyrique en France*, 2nd edition (1904), pp. 336, 534.

² Henry Lang, *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis von Portugal* (1894), p. xci.

³ King Manuel II, *Livros Antigos Portuguezes*, I (London, 1929), pp. 290, 291.

mouros andaluzes; êle não deve ser mais que um eco duma tradição poética anterior, deturpada, viciada, quasi obliterada por uma cultura incompativel com a cristã¹.

At most he will allow the literary influence of the Moors as carriers and purveyors of Greco-Latin or Byzantine influence², in much the same way as Konrad Burdach, or as Wilhelm Meyer was persuaded of the Oriental origin of mediæval Latin lyrics. In a posthumous book (it consists but of a few letters) the late Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos betrays scepticism as to the existence of a ninth-century popular poetry in *romance* in the south of Spain and as to the Spanish (Mozarabic) origin of the *moaxaha*³, although she agrees with Codera, Ribera and Menéndez Pidal that there was a 'choque fermentador ou electrizador fecundante entre Semitas e Indogermanos,' 'actividade comum e influxos mutuos'⁴ in poetry as well as in agriculture.

In an article written before Don Julián Ribera's momentous *Discursos* of 1912 and 1915 had had their full effect, she similarly insisted on mutual influence but reserved judgment as to the popular poetry⁵. In a much earlier article she denied that the *zejel* form came from the Arabic⁶, in the same way as she doubted the Mozarabic origin of the *moaxaha*. In the later letter addressed to Dr Alfredo Pimenta she concludes:

Inclino-me a *unir* as ideias dos Romanistas que acreditam em elementos indo-germanicos e as dos Arabistas que reconhecem influxos dos Semitas do Ocidente. As formas primitivas da poesia popular hispanica, o *Cantarcilho* ou *Cantar velho*, o proverbio ritmico e rimado, de 2, 3, 4 versos curtos (hemistiquios), utilizado como *refrain* em algumas poesias cultas de trovadores, e mesmo o *Vilancete* de que ha exemplos (abba), *preexistiam* e são os germes das *moaxahas* do seculo IX, X, XI: germes de sementes latinas mas que no solo e clima peninsular se tinham desenvolvido de modo especial, sobretudo na Andaluzia e no Algarve, na convivencia com Arabes⁷.

It is always the little things, the small child, the etymology of the small word, the insect, the small nation, that end by giving the most trouble; and the humble *cossante*, so apparently insignificant that it was neglected during centuries, is now not only deeply, if not yet very widely, appreciated for its exquisite beauty and spontaneous charm, but has become a bone of contention concerning which eminent critics write learned treatises. The richest and most archaic body of mediæval verse in existence is that of the Galician-Portuguese song-books. Many of the songs which they contain are directly and monotonously imitated from

¹ *Das Origens*, p. 47.

² *Ibid.*, p. 49.

³ C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, *Das Origens da Poesia Peninsular* (Lisboa, 1931), pp. 19, 20. Cf. p. 22: the 'testemunhos historicos de autoridade innegavel' belong to the twelfth century.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵ C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, *Notas sobre a canção perdida Este Es Calbi Orabi* (Separata da *Revista Lusitana*, xviii), pp. 5, 6.

⁶ C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, xxviii, p. 205.

⁷ *Das Origens da Poesia Peninsular* (1931), p. 25.

the Provençal, but there are others of a peculiar form, a peculiar fascination, a peculiar originality, and these *cantigas de amigo* have been published separately, 512 in number, by that eminent mediæval scholar Dr J. J. Nunes¹.

As to the origin and originality of these enchanting lyrics of parallel strophes controversy rages. The position remains much what it was forty years ago when Dr Henry Lang wrote:

Solange aber in der altfranzösischen Poesie keine Gattung nachgewiesen ist, aus der sich die charakteristischen Züge des galicisch-portugiesischen Frauenliedes herleiten lassen, ist doch die Vermutung nicht unberechtigt, dass sich dasselbe in der Hauptsache aus einer heimischen Volkslyrik entwickelt habe. Diese Annahme zur vollen Gewissheit zu erheben ist freilich kaum möglich².

It is of no avail to adduce solitary instances of parallelism here and there. Dr Lang himself gave a Chinese example³; so did Dr Theophilo Braga⁴; a very striking Chinese parallelistic poem is printed by Dr Rodrigues Lapa⁵. Parallels as close and nearer home are to be found in the Psalms of David. Recently Ramiro Ortiz printed as a *cantiga de amigo* a poem by Raimbaut de Vaqueiras beginning

Altas ondas que venez suz la mar,
que fay lo vent çay e lay demenar,
de mon amic savez novas comtar,
qui lay passet? no lo vei retornar⁶;

and he compared with this the celebrated and inspired *barcarola* by the obscure *jogral* Meendinho⁷. Professor Pellegrini compares *cossantes* by Codax as an even more convincing parallel⁸.

This is very interesting, and it is quite fair to give to the poem by Vaqueiras the name of *cantiga de amigo*; but there is more than one kind of *cantiga de amigo*, and the kind with whose origin and originality we are concerned is that in which the second verse repeats the first with very slight variation, often that of a single word, the alteration of an *i* word into an *a* word, *pino*, *ramo*, *amigo*, *amado*; and this we do not find in Vaqueiras' lyric. After all the sea washes many shores, and the theme of a girl asking for news of her beloved is as old as the *Song of Solomon*. Vaqueiras' poem may provide another proof of the fact, of which there never was any doubt, that the Galician and Portuguese poets closely imitated the Provençal; not that the *cossantes* (by which name we distinguish the parallelistic *cantigas de amigo*) existed in Provence.

¹ *Cantigas d'Amigo*. Three volumes (Text, Introduction, Notes), Coimbra, 1926, 1928.

² *Das Liederbuch* (1894), p. lxxxviii.

³ *Ibid.*, p. cxlii.

⁴ *Cancioneiro da Vaticana* (1878), p. ci.

⁵ *Das Origens* (1929), p. 268.

⁶ *Noterelle Provenzali*, v. Una 'cantiga de amigo' provenzale in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XLIX.

⁷ *C. da Vat.* No. 438; *Oxford Book of Portuguese Verse*, No. 10.

⁸ Professor Silvio Pellegrini in *Archivum Romanicum*, XIV (1930), p. 300.

On the other hand in Galicia and Portugal parallelism of form is constantly reappearing and is to be traced for something like eight centuries, in Portugal, Galicia and Asturias. The instances are countless; some of the most striking were given by Dr Lang¹, who appended the remark:

Aus dem obigen geht die Fortdauer der sprachlichen Überlieferung seit dem 13. Jahrhundert bis auf unsere Tage hervor. Diese spricht schon genügend dafür dass die cantigas d'amigo unserer Liederbücher, in denen und durch welche allein uns diese sprachlichen Momente bewahrt sind, im heimischen Volkslied Galiciens und Portugals wurzelten².

'Seit dem 13. Jahrhundert.' Yes, it may be said, but we would rather have a single instance *before* the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: all this long series and tradition may be derived ultimately from the parallel forms introduced in the *Cancioneiros*. As against this it may reasonably be contended that, if in the north of France lyric poetry 'fut contrariée dans son développement,' and 'se régla sur les modèles venus de Provence,' in Galicia and Portugal popular poetry was more firmly rooted, relations between the Church and the people more familiar, and the general atmosphere far more democratic. 'Em nenhuma outra literatura europeia,' says Dr Rodrigues Lapa³, 'é tão fácil como na portuguesa a demonstração da existência duma poesia lírica popular anterior aos trovadores.' This poetry now became 'hoffähig⁴.' Just as later the Renaissance brought popular poetry to the surface, so now at the end of the twelfth century the traditional poetry of the people came into the light of day; the rough *cossantes* of the people were imitated and in their more artistic form signed by individual authors. The real distinction is between onymous and anonymous poems. A humble poet who has no means of asserting his authorship is soon forgotten, but his poem may be eagerly seized on, pass from mouth to mouth, repeated, modified, transformed; and thus a succession of individuals gradually build up the final form (if any finality there be) of a traditional folk-song. Probably there has always existed some kind of popular song, very embryonic no doubt, since a mother first rocked a cradle. But it takes special circumstances to convert it from anonymous into onymous poetry, to bring it into the body of cultured literature. At distant intervals such circumstances make themselves felt. The thirteenth century in the north-west of the Peninsula was such a period. We are not to suppose the Galician *trovadores* hurrying off like some modern folk-lorist to pilgrimage shrines to listen to and imitate the dance songs of the peasant women: 'Non

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. xcv-xcvii. Cf. C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, *Cancioneiro da Ajuda* (1904), II, pp. 928 ff.

² *Das Liederbuch*, p. xcvi.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁴ C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos in *Grundriss*, p. 195.

possiamo immaginarli adunati intorno al santuario di Compostella, per raccogliere ed evolvere in canti di fattura e d'intonazione cortese i semplicissimi canti di romeria, ai quali basteranno ancora ai tempi di Gil Vicente stanze di due versi poveramente assonanzati e conchiusi da un ritornello¹. There is no necessity to imagine them doing anything of the kind (and, moreover, that is precisely what the *cossantes* signed by individual poets in the *Cancioneiros* consist of, verses of two roughly rhymed or assonanced lines and a refrain): there were the *segreis*, and the even more humble *jograis*, journeying from house to house, as a link between the anonymous poetry and the cultured imitators of that of Provence.

Nobody any longer believes, if it was ever seriously believed, that a crowd of peasants (or of princes, for that matter) collects as in a church and sets itself to compose a poem; that would be no *Naturpoesie*, but the most artificial kind of all. Nevertheless the distinction between *Naturpoesie* and *Kunstpoesie* subsists. The former has in it 'algo primario, elemental, tan inconfundible con el artificio de cualquier estilo personal, por sencillo que sea éste, como un producto natural con los fabricados por el hombre².'

That a very ancient poetry was indigenous to Galicia there can be no doubt. Professor Ribera speaks of a 'lirica gallega antiquísima,' which he considers was spread in Andalucía by the many Galician slaves of the Moors; and Professor Menéndez Pidal believes in 'una primitiva poesía gallega, hoy perdida³.' Was there a link between this primitive poetry and the poetry of the *Cancioneiros* and what was the link? Was the *jogral* the means of spreading the *cossantes* of the *trovadores* among the people, or did he introduce the *cossantes* of the people to the *trovadores*? Although the *cossantes* of the *Cancioneiros* are the signed work of individual poets and are therefore *Kunstpoesie*, they contain unmistakable vestiges of the 'algo inconfundible' of popular poetry, even apart from the archaisms that have been noticed in them and which have sometimes been explained away as hispanisms. Dr Rodrigues Lapa has some interesting remarks on these archaisms⁴, showing that they occur mainly in the initial themes of the poems, and that therefore one must be chary of making such emendations as he himself had suggested⁵ in order to

¹ Cesare de Lollis, *Dalle Cantigas de amor a quelle de amigo*, in *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal* (1925), I, p. 621.

² R. Menéndez Pidal, *Poesía popular y poesía tradicional en la literatura española* (Oxford, 1922), p. 9.

³ *Poesía juglaresca y juglares* (1924), p. 148. Cf. p. 329: the *cantigas de amigo* are 'género sin duda indígena y antiquísimo.'

⁴ *Das Orígens*, p. 341.

⁵ In *O Texto das Cantigas d'amigo* (1929). See also *ibid.*, p. 12 n.

bring the metre of the rest of the poem into line with that of the initial theme. The same author composed both *cantigas de amor* and *cantigas de amigo* and *cossantes*: 'a vos nunca nos vimos fazer cantar d'amor nen d'amigo,' says the *jogral* Lourenço to Rodrig' Eanes¹; and the fact is plain from the poems under each author's name in the *Cancioneiros*. But this fact, which might seem to tell in favour of a common (Provençal) origin, really tells against it. The gods and booksellers permit the same poet to write inspired verse and dull commonplace verse; but when we find poet after poet dull and commonplace in his imitation of Provençal poetry and various (as various in their monotony as wild flowers are various), fascinating or inspired in the parallel-strophed *cantigas de amigo*, we draw the conclusion that they had a different inspiration. They must have had models for these poems, they who so faithfully copied the Provençal forms in the *cantigas de amor*: but these models are not to be found in the Provençal poetry. There can be little doubt that the models existed nearer home. The *cossantes* of the *Cancioneiros* are, says Dr Nunes, 'inteiramente populares, isso é, construídas à imitação de outras que sôbre o mesmo tema o povo cantaria²'; 'rigorosamente nacionais, isto é, feitos sôbre modelos populares³'; 'o paralelismo que caracteriza as cantigas parallelísticas ou bailadas encadeadas revela bem, pela simplicidade da estrutura e repetição dos mesmos versos, a sua origem plebeia⁴.' Similarly Dr Rodrigues Lapa: 'há na nossa literatura trovadoresca dois lirismos de diferente natureza e de diversa origem. Um deles, importado de França, teve, como em nenhures, a rara fortuna de suscitar um intenso lirismo nacional, preexistente mas não fixado. O outro, nativo, nada ou quási nada deve a influências estranhas, a não ser o impulso inicial que o revelou⁵.' Dr Rodrigues Lapa's wide erudition is always expressed with admirable lucidity; this lucid concreteness is in itself almost a new thing in Portuguese scholarship. One may not agree with all his conclusions, of course. It is difficult to see why a similar embryonic lyrism in Castille, advocated by Professor Menéndez Pidal⁶, should be considered very improbable⁷. The probability

¹ *Cancioneiro da Vaticana*, No. 1032.

² *Cantigas d'Amigo*, I, *Introdução* (1928), p. 17.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 86. Cf. pp. 129, 130 and in A. Forjaz de Sampaio, *História da Literatura Portuguesa Ilustrada*, Fasc. IV, p. 100; and J. J. Nunes, *Cantigas de Martim Codaz* (1931), pp. 8, 9 n.: 'que tais cantigas eram producto da nação inteira, tomada no seu conjuncto' (é opinião que nunca tive).

⁴ J. J. Nunes, *As cantigas parallelísticas em Gil Vicente* in *Revista Lusitana*, XII (1909), p. 244.

⁵ M. Rodrigues Lapa, *Das Origens*, p. 59.

⁶ R. Menéndez Pidal, *Estudios Literarios* (1920), pp. 279, 280, 317.

⁷ M. Rodrigues Lapa, *Das Origens* (1929), p. 46.

is rather that, far from being non-existent, it was too common, and disdained, neglected, and passed over by the collector and cultured poet. The 'impulso inicial,' present in Galicia, was here absent.

We accept, then, the fact that the parallel-strophed poems on which the poems of the *Cancioneiros* were based were indigenous and national. But were they popular, of popular origin, composed as well as sung by the people? Professor Pellegrini, who believes that the Galician-Portuguese *cossantes* were not indigenous, naturally denies them a popular birth. In his very able review of Dr Nunes' collection he sums up:

La storia del genere delle *cantigas d'amigo*, sommariamente delineata, non può essere diversa della seguente: un individuo ha poetato primamente in questa maniera, trovando, immediatamente o in seguito, per ragioni estetiche o per prestigio personale, consensi, echi, imitatori, ciascuno dei quali a sua volta ha suscitato un moto analogo; questo 'gusto' è stato nel sec. XIII e nella prima metà del XIV una moda rifioriente con rinnovato vigore ad ogni nuovo omaggio prestatole dalla corte o dall' aristocrazia; una moda che a poco dai palazzi è scesa nelle piazze e nei campi, e s' è inserita infine nel patrimonio delle tradizioni popolari, dove, a quanto pare, se ne trovano tracce tuttora. È dunque esattamente il contrario di quel che si pretende quando si afferma che il genere delle *cantigas d'amigo* dai campi e dalle piazze è salito ai palazzi e alle corti¹.

Dr Rodrigues Lapa, while he agrees with Monaci, Dr Henry Lang², Dona Carolina Michaëlis and others that the *cossantes* went from the people to the palace, agrees with Dr Pellegrini that they were not originally of popular origin. 'A poesia produzida pelos poetas populares é a menos popular de todas, porque o seu poder de irradiação é mínimo. . . . O povo, a massa anónima, não cria verdadeiramente: assimila, transforma e conserva. . . o povo só se apropria daquilo que é verdadeiramente belo³.' Dr Rodrigues Lapa derives the *cossantes* from the tropes and sequences of the Roman Catholic liturgy, and he insists that the very word *troubadour* is to be derived not from *trouver* but from *trope*. He brings a wealth of argument to the support of the liturgical origin of these parallel-strophed poems. Other critics had pointed in passing to this source, but no one has previously dealt with it so thoroughly and in a way which may be very difficult to refute. It might be asked why, if the people derived these songs from the liturgy, the troubadours should not have done the same: but the anonymous poets of the people, who perhaps do not originate or create, receive, modify and transform in a way which a cultured poet does not and could not do. Moreover the people had its dance rhythms, its refrains, and a more homely parallelism

¹ *Archivum Romanicum*, XIV (1930), p. 290; and p. 291 n.

² E.g., *op. cit.*, p. lxxviii: 'mehr oder weniger nachgeahmt, kaum aber selbst dem Volksmunde abgelauscht.'

³ *Das Origens*, p. 201.

of its own. Even so fervent a champion of liturgical and clerkly, ecclesiastical, Latin influence as Dr Rodrigues Lapa hesitates:

Aqui surge uma dúvida, que a falta de material de estudo não deixa capazmente resolver: na poesia popular havia já paralelismo ou, pelo menos, tendência para êle, ou a repetição paralelística dever-se há unicamente à influência do canto litúrgico? Supomos, com risco de parecer contrariar a nossa própria tese, que o paralelismo é um caracter da poesia primitiva, anterior portanto à influência eclesiástica¹. De qualquer modo que seja, estamos convencidos de que a Igreja obstou à perda do paralelismo na nossa lírica popular².

After all, perhaps modern criticism tends to be unjust to the powers of the illiterate people. Dr Rodrigues Lapa, indeed, in the view quoted above, allows it not any creative power but an exquisite taste; and it should be observed that this is exactly what the *cossantes* possess: no skill of composition but an exquisite poetical taste. On the other hand a writer whose opinion deserves great weight, because he lived among the people for seventy years and knew them intimately, the nineteenth-century novelist Pereda, writing of the people of the Montaña, to the immediate north of Asturias and Galicia, denies it both taste and skill in composition:

Autores de mucha y muy merecida fama aseguran que el pueblo es un gran poeta: ¿De dónde proceden, preguntáis (les hubiera yo dicho), esos cantares tan bellos que se oyen (muy de tarde en tarde por cierto) en boca de los sencillos trovadores de las calles y de los bosques? De vosotros, señores míos, de vosotros, o de otros poetas como vosotros, que los han creado tan bellos en la forma como en el pensamiento; el pueblo los ha hallado después, los ha *traducido* a su lenguaje tosco y vicioso, los ha aplicado el aire que, en su sentir, mejor les cuadraba, y se los ha cantado en seguida. De modo que, en mi humilde opinión, lo único que deben esos ligeros fragmentos de bella poesía al pueblo que los manosea es el favor de encontrarse mutilados y contrahechos a lo mejor de la vida cuando nacieron perfectos... el pueblo, es decir, la masa indocta, no solamente no es capaz de crear nada bello, pero ni aun de conservarlo³.

As against this it may be well to quote once more the passage in which Fray Martín Sarmiento, over half a century before Pereda was born, confirms an even earlier witness, Faria e Sousa, as to the poetical talent of the Galicians and Portuguese peasantry:

Con gracejo dixo Manuel Faria en la página 680 de su *Epítome de las Historias Portuguesas*⁴ que cada fuente en Portugal y cada monte son Hippocrenes y Parnasos. Quiere decir que en Portugal es tan connatural la Poesía de que se habla que cada Pastor es Poeta y cada moza de cántaro Poetisa. Esto, que es comun en toda España, es más particular en Portugal y Galicia⁵. Además de esto he observado que en Galicia las mugeres no solo son Poetisas sino tambien Músicas. Generalmente hablando, así en Castilla como en Portugal y en otras Provincias, los hombres son los que componen las coplas é inventan los tonos ó ayres; y así se ve que en este género de coplas populares hablan los hombres con las mugeres ó para amarlas ó para satyrizarlas. En Galicia es al contrario. En la mayor parte de las coplas Gallegas hablan las mugeres

¹ *Das Origens*, p. 270.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Tipos y Paisajes*, 4th ed. (1920), pp. 486-8.

⁴ Madrid, 1628.

⁵ *Memorias para la historia de la poesía y poetas españoles*, etc. (*Obras postumas del Rmo. P. M. F. Martín Sarmiento, Benedictino*, Madrid, 1775, p. 237, § 537.)

con los hombres, y es porque ellas son las que componen las coplas, sin artificio alguno; y ellas mismas inventan los tonos ó ayres a que las han de cantar, sin tener idea del Arte Músico¹.

It might perhaps be argued that the courtly poets, aware of this tradition and of the rule that in the *cantiga de amigo* 'elas falan na primeira cobra,' made their *cossantes* deliberately simple. No doubt they made them as simple as they could, but the fact of the tradition remains, and the question is: Were the women of the people capable of producing anything like the *cossante* as we know it in the fascinating pages of the *Cancioneiros* and of Gil Vicente's plays? No doubt it is a far cry from such a popular poem as that beginning

No penedo, João Preto,
E no penedo²

to that beginning

Del rosal vengo, mi madre,
Vengo del rosal³,

and to the treasures of Zorro and Meogo, Codax and Roy Fernandez, Admiral Chariño and King Dinis, Torneol and Meendinho. But the embryo is there, and the embryo of the refrain (*No penedo*). The rough song *No penedo* is sung and danced. We are reminded that, when the peasant Benito in another of Vicente's plays is about to sing a song, he says 'Hold my stick': he is going to dance as he sings. As to parallelism, the popular quatrains of Galicia, which are certainly more primitive than those of Spain and Portugal, are full of it:

Vela ahí vai, vela ahí vai,
a raposa pol-o millo:
ela dis que non fai mal
pero vaino sacudindo.

This is followed in the collection of Pérez Ballesteros by another quatrain:

Vela ahí vai, vela ahí vai,
a raposa pol-o prado:
ela dis que non fai mal
pero vaino levantando⁴.

One of the popular echoes, it may be said, of the parallelism introduced by the thirteenth-century *trovadores*. But the important point to consider is whether a peasant could not have composed the first quatrain, and a second have introduced the alteration, a natural alteration, as it were of the music from treble to bass. Primitive improvisation, dance

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 238, § 538.

² *Obras de Gil Vicente* (Hamburg, 1834), II, p. 488.

³ *Ibid.*, II, p. 481.

⁴ José Pérez Ballesteros, *Cancionero Popular Gallego*, III (1888), p. 33, Nos. 51 and 52.

and dance refrains, and amœbæan song are earlier even than the Christian Church. Such quatrains, and the *cossantes* likewise, can scarcely be said to have been composed, they are simple cries of the heart: 'queixos saudosos, lamentos, suspiros¹.' If we are to deny the possibility of such being the work of illiterate peasant men and women, we must go further and, when a peasant says to his wife 'put on the pot to boil,' we must find in his words an echo of Homer. We must remember that Pereda was writing four centuries after the Renaissance had introduced a sharp cleavage between culture and the people, and not deny to the peasants of the Middle Ages a capacity for simple song of real beauty and refinement. Even more significant is the appearance of parallelism in the *muiñeras*, those strongly rhythmical poems so frequent in the popular poetry of Galicia and so frequently copied by the Spanish dramatists who turned to popular sources, for instance Lope de Vega and Tirso de Molina². Take for instance the following:

Este é tempo d'estroupele, estroupele,
este é o tempo d'estroupelear:
este é o tempo de mazá-l-o liño,
este é o tempo de o mazar.

It will scarcely be denied that the most illiterate peasant women might be capable of inventing and singing that as they worked at breaking the flax. Nor will it be denied that the quatrain has a certain poetical fascination. But the point is that its parallelism seems to derive rather from the natural rhythm of the work in hand than from the parallelism of any Church liturgy or trovador's *cossante*. It is the monotonous rhythm of breaking the flax, of rocking a cradle, of the mill-wheel turning. From such rhythmic motions sprang the primitive parallelism of the songs of the people; it was confirmed by the parallelism of the liturgical sequences, and it was brought into written literature by some *jogral* of genius who realised its possibilities as a contrast to that other and drearier monotony of the *cantiga de amor*. The *cossante* of the *Cancioneiros* thus has a composite origin. It was foreign and indigenous, scholarly and traditional. Its parallelism came up from the rhythmic songs, dances, proverbs and refrains of the people; it was met half way, as it were, by the 'clerks' who spread the parallelism of the sequences among the people and thus introduced the Oriental note, that of the poetry of the Old Testament and that of the sequences of Greco-Latin origin.

¹ C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, *A propósito de Martim Codax* in *Revista de Filología Española*, II (1915), p. 261.

² Similarity between the *muiñera* and some of the *cantigas de amigo* was noticed by Pérez Ballesteros (*Cancionero*, III, p. 199). Other instances are given by Dr Rodrigues Lapa, *Das Origens*, pp. 313, 314.

We know how the more serious poets of the Peninsula were constantly making efforts to wean the people from its profane songs to something more spiritual and religious, and how the people might accept the scholarly gift only to mould it in its turn into something more profane. Thus the parallelism was already of composite origin when the *jogral* of the thirteenth century acted as a link, carrying the rough parallelistic song as he heard it sung and danced 'nas vilas e nas aldeas' to his patron's castle and carrying it back in a slightly more artistic dress, to be once more absorbed by the people.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. João do Estoril, Portugal.

MOHAMMED AND HIS FOLLOWERS IN DANTE

DANTE shows much the same view of the Mohammedans as his contemporaries, and it is a low and negligent one. Certain of them, it is true, he ranges among his great men; accepting the general opinion, he twice mentions Saladin in the best of company¹, many times he quotes six Arabic philosophers with high respect but without reference to their racial religion, and it is merely as great philosophers that with rare tolerance he puts Averroes and Avicenna in Limbo. The Saracens form a sect apart, like the Jews, Christians, 'gentili,' even 'filosofi'; sometimes they are grouped especially with the Jews, but never with the Christians². They are treated as more alien than the Jews, and with much more antipathy³; the poet's own feeling presumably is expressed by his crusading ancestor Cacciaguida—'gente turpa,' 'la nequizia di quella legge⁴.' All this is quite what we find in dozens of practical and informed writers before Dante's day and long after.

The Saracens make an almost equally certain appearance at the end of the *Purgatorio* (xxxii, 130-5), where, among calamities in the history of the Church, the breaking away of the floor of the church's Chariot by a dragon seems to symbolise the loss through Mohammed; that this is signified, and not the schism between Rome and Constantinople, is thought by some though not all recent critics, and is indicated by the evidence. Dante never refers to the breach with the Orthodox Church. While our perspective shows that it became substantially final in 1054, every few decades thereafter the Latin Church attempted to heal it, with apparent success in 1204 and in Dante's youth (1274), and there were Latin patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, sometimes instead of Greek, from about 1100. Though the prospect was not so bright when he was writing, a little later the attempts began again. Only since 1472 has communion never been resumed. Such an explanation of the passage occurred to none of the early critics. To the mediæval eye the situation was uncertain and fluctuating, not catastrophic; the amazing speed of

¹ *Conv.* iv, 11; *Inf.* iv, 129 (but even among the righteous unbaptised in Limbo, he is 'solo in parte').

² *Inf.* xxvii, 87; *Conv.* ii, 9; *Epist.* viii, 3; and cf. *Conv.* ii, 5.

³ *Purg.* xxiii, 103 ff.; *Par.* xix, 108 ff.; *Mon.* iii, 14; *Epist.* v, 2; these compared with the worst strictures on the Jews, *Par.* v, 81, xxxii, 132.

⁴ *Par.* xv, 142 ff. It would be hard to find another pertinent passage except those examined below. *Canz.* xviii, Oxford Dante ('Macometto cieco,' l. 72, as a type of some sin), is certainly spurious.

the defection which spread east to Persia and west to Spain, and not mere interrupted relations with ancient patriarchates, is suggested by

A sè traendo la coda maligna,
trasse del fondo, e gissen vago vago.

This points to a more definitive breach even than the heresy symbolised just before. The minutely accurate symbolism in the pageant of the Church is generally recognised. This sense of Mohammedanism as not an ordinary schism, but as having wholly robbed Christendom of lands once Christian, the only great losses it ever suffered, was much in the mediæval mind¹, and is quite unlike the usual attitude toward the Eastern Church. The dragon not only seems to represent the Moslem defection, but is probably Mohammed himself. So in one of Matthew Paris' three accounts of him, quoting the passage in *Revelation* (xii, 3-9) which Dante used: Mohammed multiplied his followers 'ut in eo adimpleatur quod in Apocalipsi scribitur, *Draco traxit secum medietatem stellarum cauda sua de coelo. Vere Machomet draco venenosus*².'

In the literature of the mediæval West there are two ways of viewing him and his religion (to simplify a complicated matter). The one exaggerates the theological differences from Christianity, with its notions of idolatry, the unblest trinity Mahound, Apollin, Tervagant, and the like; and is the popular view, found in romances, ill-informed chronicles and elsewhere³. There is much of it even in the crusade chronicles. Dante ignores it. The more learned account is based on better knowledge; it tends to be biographical and historical, and to show more of the true relation of Mohammed and his religion to Christianity, but usually with little as to his theology. At times it is intelligent and comparatively unprejudiced; in most writers it is garbled and bitterly hostile, sometimes

¹ Alcuin, *Patrol. Lat.*, C, 143; Urban II's oration before the first crusade (Ordericus Vitalis, ix, 2; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum*, Rolls Ser., p. 394); the *Crónica General* compiled by Alfonso el Sabio (chaps. 493, 559); William of Tripoli's *Tractatus*, cap. viii (in H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Berlin, 1883, pp. 575-98); Brunetto Latini's *Trésor* (*Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France*, v, 5, p. 161); etc.

² *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls Ser.), iii, p. 356. Similarly Benvenuto da Imola, da Buti, della Lana. Others say Antichrist, or are vaguer. In no case are ll. 130-1 quite clear. William of Newburgh (v, 14) compares Mohammed to the beast like a dragon in *Apoc.* xiii, 11 (much used by churchmen who wished to call names, *Patrol. Lat.*, clxxxii, pp. 270, 535, 537). Some modern critics take Dante's dragon to be Satan, as ultimate cause, because of *Apoc.* xii, 9 ('draco ille . . . qui vocatur diabolus'). But if Matthew Paris nevertheless took this dragon as Mohammed, how much more Dante, who does not mention the *Apocalypse*. Frederick II in July, 1239, called Pope Gregory IX after this dragon (though pretending no fulfilment of prophecy), and in 1245 a papal adherent returned the compliment (Huillard-Bréholles, *Hist. diplom. Frid. sec.*, Paris, 1852-9, v, i, p. 349, vi, i, pp. 279 f.). Interpretations of the passage in Dante are very fully discussed by Moore, *Studies in Dante*, ii, pp. 204 f.

³ See, e.g., the careful survey by R. Schröder, *Glaube und Aberglaube in den altfranzösischen Dichtungen* (Erlangen, 1886).

the offspring of crusading zeal¹. These last afford the best background for Dante's chief passage on Mohammed and his followers, though he says too little to allow certainty as to his knowledge or its source.

In the *Inferno* Maometto and Ali appear among spreaders of disunion ('scommettendo,' xxvii, 136) and 'di scandalo e di scisma' (xxviii, 35). This to a modern is at first one of the most startling things in the *Commedia*; Mohammed is to Dante, says one editor, 'a mere sectarian who had taken up Christianity and perverted its meaning.' At first sight there seems here a plain implication that Mohammed had been a Christian, and his religion a mere schism from the Christian Church; at least according to nearly all modern Dantists, a formidable array to one who is fain to 'recumbere in novissimo loco.' The explanation has been sought in the most sensational of the traditions in Dante's day, that Mohammed had been a cardinal, been foiled in his hopes of the papacy, and had salved his wounds by founding a new religion. This is clearly based on an earlier tradition that he had been merely a tool of such a disappointed prelate; it is found no earlier than the end of the thirteenth century², probably originated then, and is in none of the Latin and more respectable accounts. Further, while it is retailed by several of the early Dante commentators, it is ignored by most and expressly rejected by the *Ottimo Comento*, about 1334—'Del quale Maometto si figne altrimenti: dicono alcuni, ma non è vero, ch'egli fu cardinale, e savio scienziato,' etc.³ Its long vogue seems due in part to the attribution of it to the excellent commentator Benvenuto da Imola, absurdly made in the mid-seventeenth

¹ William of Tripoli, a kindly Dominican at Acre, writing probably in 1273, shows how much Christianity there is in the Koran, and declares that they who believe the book are not far from the Christian faith and the way of salvation. (*Tractatus*, cap. xlvii; see in Prutz, p. 187 above.) Some Christians were touched at finding the respectful treatment of the Virgin Mary in Moslem writings. There are somewhat moderate views also in *obiter dicta* by William of Tyre, in Alfonso's *Crónica General*, and in one of Matthew Paris' accounts (*op. cit.*, III, pp. 343 ff.). More unfavourable accounts are mentioned below. Admirable surveys of Islam among the more educated Christians, giving many of the above-mentioned references, are by A. d'Ancona, *Giorn. stor. della Lett. ital.*, XIII, pp. 199–281 (reviewed by Renan, *Journal des Savants*, 1889, pp. 421–8), and H. Prutz (see above), especially pp. 72–88; also M. Asín Palacios, *La Escatología musulmana en la Divina Comedia* (Madrid, 1919), pp. 299 ff., E. du Méril, *Poésies pop. lat. du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1847), pp. 374 ff., and Richard Otto, *Modern Language Notes*, IV, pp. 22 ff., 89 ff. There are short accounts, not mentioned by these, in late crusade chronicles (*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, Paris, 1844–, *Historiens occidentaux*, V, pp. 53, 637); and, seemingly the earliest at all, ignored by d'Ancona, the *Continuatio* of Isidor's chronicle attributed to St Ildefonsus (*Patrol. Lat.*, xovi, pp. 317–24). Asín (p. 330) mentioned an important account by the Spaniard St Peter Pascual, which seems unobtainable in America.

² In the Italian verse versions of Brunetto Latini's *Trésor* (*D'Ancona*, pp. 199 ff.). It is not in the original, nor in the Italian prose version by Giamboni (ed. by Chabaille, Bologna, 1878).

³ Pisa, 1827, I, p. 481. It is in the 'Anonimo Laurenziano' (ed. Selmi), and with variations in 'Jacopo Alighieri' (Florence, 1915), and della Lana (Milan, 1865); ignored by Pietro Alighieri, Benvenuto da Imola, da Buti, and others of the fourteenth century.

century¹, and often repeated since. If not actually 'contradicted' by Dante's reasonable ideas on the Mohammedans, it is in contrast with them; and so needless here that a lover of Dante seems justified in reluctance to think he believed such a cock-and-bull story. Even after eminent Dante scholars have spoken, some lighting of the background may prove of value in itself, and possibly even suggest an alternative explanation.

First, as to schism and scandal, both technical words in moral theology. 'Schisma,' it is true enough to say, always in the Middle Ages had its modern sense of the separation from the Church of a group of Christians which remains Christian². It is sometimes associated by St Thomas Aquinas with 'scandalum'; i.e., as an example of it³. 'Scandalum' ('a thing which trips one up') does not mean something shocking which must be hushed up, the often uncharitable misinterpretation of its use in the modern Roman Church. It is a special and particular sin, according to Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura⁴. It means the doing of something not right in itself which becomes either directly or by setting a bad example an occasion of sin by others; 'quod dictum vel factum minus rectum praebens occasionem ruinae sit scandalum,' says Thomas; and again, 'Scandalum importat impedimentum aliquod, quod alicui apponitur in vita spirituali.' The guilt is greater in him who sets than in him who follows the example. The word is sometimes used less precisely of the occasion to sin taken by one person in consequence of another's justifiable action. Thus St Thomas of Canterbury asserted the claims of the Church against Henry II as the less of two evils, but 'cum scandalo regis'⁵. The discussion is substantially the same in St Bonaventura; to break a public vow is 'scandalum,' and a sin against one's neighbour⁶. Evidently various sins by others might follow from 'scandalum,' but that which followed from every case in Dante is evil discord.

It is not self-evident why these sins are punished in this part of hell. They are not mentioned among most of the others by Virgil when at the tomb of Anastasius he maps out for Dante the lower hell of the violent

¹ By Gabriel Naudé, librarian of Cardinal Mazarin. See Bayle's *Dictionnaire* (Amsterdam, 1730), III, p. 264; du Ménil, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

² St Bonaventura is once a little vaguer—'*Schisma* est illicita dissensio eorum, inter quos debet esse unitas' (*Opera*, Paris, 1864-71, VII, p. 237). But elsewhere he recognises or implies only the stricter sense, like Thomas Aquinas. Both *σχίσμα* and *σκάνδαλον* are used in ecclesiastical Greek as in Latin.

³ *Summa Theologica*, II, II, 43, 7.

⁴ *Summa*, II, II, 43, 3; VI, 373.

⁵ *Summa*, II, II, 43, 1, 5, 8. The ideas are based on Sts Augustine and Jerome, and especially on such scriptural passages as *St Matt.* xviii, 7, *Rom.* xiv, 21, *Rev.* ii, 14, whatever may be the earlier history of the word. Any ambiguity is due to the impinging of scholastic precision on the less defined New Testament usage. Cf. *Monarchia*, III, 9.

⁶ VI, 373; VII, 372, 530; XI, 352.

and fraudulent (xi, 16 ff.). But the chief point is this. In the lowest division, from the panders at the top to the traitors at the bottom, every other sin clearly involves deceit, furtive methods at the very least. But here between false counsellors and cheats are those who cause division, and by sinful acts lead others into sin. In the essence of these sins, and in the discussion of them by the philosophers cited above, there is no suggestion of deceit. Curio (ll. 94 ff.), though otherwise an intriguer, was not fraudulent in persuading Cæsar to begin civil war, for which he is condemned by Dante and Lucan; nor was Mosca de' Lambertini (ll. 103 ff.) in advising the murder which divided Florence, according to Giovanni Villani (v, 38); he is condemned for the unforeseen consequences of his ruffianism, a capital example of the grounds of judgment in the *Inferno*. It is true that the mediæval accounts show Mohammed as a deceiver, 'seductor Mahometh,' in gaining his followers, but herein he is the exception among his fellow-sinners. Nothing is easier than to raise near-sighted difficulties, but this is a real one, on which the following may be ventured. It is recognised that the organisation of the *Inferno* is fundamentally on a basis of the actual results of a man's wickedness, and its consequences to his fellow-men¹. Sins primarily against a man's self, even against God, such as heresy and blasphemy (cantos ix and xiv), are placed less low than sins of fraud, sins peculiar to man which cut the bonds uniting men (xi, 25 ff., 55 ff.)². But so also do the sins of schism and scandal cut the bonds uniting men. They are put here, though they do not involve fraud, because they produce the same evil, distrust and disunion. An Undistributed Middle is a small price to pay for poetic congruity. Whether or not we have here a case of the development of Dante's plan as he proceeded, such as has been suggested now and then³, he holds to what is most essential in his plan. Disunion produced in religion, state or family, is all there is in common to these sinners' acts, and appears in their penalty.

The most important matter is that Dante discriminates in no way between the two kinds of sinners. They are introduced as

quei che scommettendo acquistano carco;

¹ Cf. K. Witte, *Dante-Forschungen*, II, pp. 134 ff.

² Herein for once Dante differs from Thomas Aquinas. The latter puts 'haeresis' under 'infidelitas,' which is a greater sin than 'schisma' because an offence directly against God, while the latter is only against the unity of the Church; heretics should be put to death, but of schismatics he does not say this (*Summa Theologica*, II, ii, 11, 1 and 3; II, ii, 39, 2). Dante has St Thomas only so far with him that the latter pronounces schism the greatest of all offences against one's neighbour, because it does the greatest harm to the greatest number: 'Tamen inter peccata, quae sunt in proximum, peccatum schismatis videtur esse maximum, quia est contra spirituale bonum multitudinis' (II, ii, 39, 2).

³ Edward Moore, *Studies in Dante*, Series II, pp. 168 ff.

and later Maometto describes them:

tutti gli altri, che tu vedi qui,
seminator di scandalo e di scisma
fur vivi, e però son fessi così.

The whole 'trista greggia,' more than a hundred of whom stop to look at Dante, includes those who have produced 'scommettitura' in either way or both; but of the half-dozen or so who are named none is called a 'scismatico' rather than a 'scandalizzatore.' It would seem that Dante pairs schism and scandal that all the sinners whom he wished to include here might without further parley be seen to belong in one class or both. But he no more says that Mohammed is a schismatic than that Lucan's Curio is. He is simply one who has despoiled Christendom, and by wicked fraud led others into the sin of apostasy. The word schism has had critical vogue here because it is more convenient and clear to moderns than the others used by Dante.

Having protected himself, perhaps deliberately, against theological inexactitude, Dante thought of Mohammed more vaguely as something like a schismatic as well as a 'scandalizzator.' No other named sinners justify the 'scisma' of l. 35, and the warning to the living schismatic Fra Dolcino is sent by him. Several of the early commentators (who do not always comprehend Dante's discriminations) call him a schismatic. There is a slight ground for the idea in the usual mediæval accounts of his life; most of these present him, not it is true as a Christian¹, but as instructed in Christianity by a heretic monk, and as founding his religion in part on this basis. A new religion with some resemblance to Christianity, which had deprived the Church of vast provinces, is a quasi-schism. Had Mohammed been once a Christian, he would belong among apostates if there were such a group. Had he been invincibly ignorant of Christianity and deemed by Christians a laudable character, he might have been with his follower Saladin in Limbo. He might even be in the fiery tombs with the heretics; hardly in the view of a strict theologian², but in Dante's scheme, which puts there even the pagan Epicurus and his followers. He is actually 'tra l'anime più nere,' not because he is a proper schismatic but because this is a worse place. Further,

¹ As Prutz wrongly says (p. 77).

² The Moslems are usually 'pagani,' having none of the sacraments but matrimony, and too much of that. Peter the Venerable (*Patrol. Lat.*, CLXXXIX, pp. 669 ff.) hesitates to call them 'haeretici,' as being half 'ethnici.' But other ecclesiastical writers call Saracens, antipopes and Orthodox Greeks alike heretics, though according to Bonaventura (*l.c.*) schism does not imply heresy. In their terms of abuse churchmen are often more lavish than nice.

none of the heretics who are named founded aggressive sects¹. The vast loss to the Christian world caused by him is the prodigious thing and what interests Dante in him. What justifies his punishment is his scandalous and fraudulent methods, and sinning against the light. But it is hard to see how he could be punished for schism alone; and impossible to justify a flat statement that Dante regarded him as the founder of a schism in Christendom. Or such is the unavoidable impression on one who has been looking into ideas of Islam in the West.

His results have been such that nothing can be too bad for him. His punishment is not only the most hideous mutilation of all in this valley; it is hardly equalled anywhere in the *Inferno* for repulsiveness, certainly not for ignoble bodily exposure and grotesqueness of description. His stretching his body open when he sees the poet watching him suggests less of fortitude than of a desire to be gazed at, greater even than usual among the damned². Besides the symbolism of the splitting, Dante's picture probably shows the antipathy aroused in him by accounts of the Prophet's life³, most of which pick out or invent details to excite prejudice and disgust. There is no grandeur in his villainy, as with Voltaire's Mahomet. Not to mention that he is low-born, mercenary, thievish and cruel, stress is constantly laid on the sensuality of his life and doctrine and of the paradise promised to his adherents. Even gossipy innuendo is not spared, in the inevitable allusions to the opulent widow Khadija; the Middle Ages approved such marriages, but not for a religious leader. His pretence of interviews with Gabriel is merely to lend dignity to his epileptic seizures. He produces his effects by trickery, and also by enchantment, the practiser of which was invested to mediæval eyes with no sinister impressiveness, but was a shabby *déclassé*, as is amply evident in one of the most learned books of late years⁴. The particulars as to his death could hardly be more degrading. In one of Matthew Paris' accounts, for example, he goes out drunk, falls in a fit on a dunghill, and is there

¹ Some such people obviously might be put in either class, as is implied by St Bonaventura (vii, 528). Dante escapes the dilemma by not naming here such heresiarchs as Arius and Nestorius; his principal ambiguous case is Mohammed's.

² Mentre che tutto in lui veder m' attacco,
guardommi, e con le man s' aperse il petto,
dicendo, 'Or vedi come io mi dilacco;
vedi come storpiato è Maometto.' (xxviii, 28-31.)

One hesitates to use modern psychological lingo, but the insight of a poet sometimes anticipates the analysis of the scientific man.

³ In the more popular tradition he is a deity or demon, and does not excite this personal disgust (see for example Schröder, *op. cit.*, p. 153, etc.).

⁴ G. L. Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1929), especially chap. II.

smothered by a sow, which mangles his corpse¹. To a reader of this sort of thing his human dignity was gone for ever.

The next figure reflects a feeling if not precisely genial at least not so disrespectful.

Dinanzi a me sen va piangendo Ali,
fesso nel volto dal mento al ciuffetto. (xxviii, 32-3.)

These words of Mohammed apparently convey neither pitying affection for his kinsman nor self-congratulation on his own stoicism and Ali's tears, but a mere identification of him. Dante implies no slur on Ali; tears in the poem are not a sign of weakness². It is probably by mere chance that his punishment has some resemblance to the actual account of his death in Arabic historians; his forehead was pierced to the brain by a poisoned sabre, and he died three days later³. All his named companions are mutilated symbolically; Curio and Mosca in the parts they had offended with, da Medicina in many parts because he had divided many people, Bertran de Born by separation of his head from its source in the body because he had divided son from father. So the two Moslem leaders, as others have noted, after splitting the whole world are together split through the whole face and body; Ali, the less important and less base, in the smaller and higher part of his form. This makes extremely unlikely, if not impossible, the explanation of his punishment still common among critics, though discarded lately by some, that he is split in the head because he was eventually the cause of a split in the headship of Islam. But his wound is in the face, not the whole skull. Further, Mohammed in the poem gives no hint of resentment against him. The main point is that it is difficult to fancy Ali punished in the Christian hell for dividing the abhorred Islam; Dante

¹ *Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series, I, p. 270, III, p. 360; Matthew's third account was mentioned before). Hence the Moslem prohibition of wine and pork, according to some. LL. 24-7 suggest some of the details in the mediæval biographies. Similar degrading accounts are in Anastasius, Siebert, Landolfus, Zonaras, Guibert de Nogent, Hugo of Flavigny, Peter the Venerable, Embricho of Mainz (pseudo-Hildebert), William of Newburgh, Walter of Compiègne, the *Roman de Mahomet*, the *Legenda Aurea*, Vincent of Beauvais, Matthew Paris, third account, Raymond Lull. (Incidentally, a line in Embricho's account (*Patrol. Lat.*, CLXXI, p. 1359) is more like *Inf.* v, 56, than the passage in Orosius which Dante certainly used: 'Sic quicquid libuit lege nova licuit.')

² Ugolino is no weaking (xxxiii, 9), nor even Filippo Argenti (viii, 36-7). The traitors all weep. Only Jason, kingly above all, 'non par lagrima spanda.'

³ Huart in *Encyclopædia of Islam* (Leyden and London, 1908 ff.), I, p. 284. Even if Dante were likely to have known the tale, the suggestion would be insignificant. Punishments in the *Inferno* reflect the manner of life, not of death. The punishment of heretics in burning tombs is not a case in point. It is true that (by design or not) it combines the usual death of heretics by burning with the occasional burying alive. But the burning was avowedly a foretaste of what awaited them in hell. See C. H. Haskins, *Studies in Mediæval Culture* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 237-9. 'Allegorically the torments represent the sins themselves,' as C. H. Grandgent says in his edition (Boston, 1909 ff.), I, p. 5, my point of departure all through.

was no Nathan der Weise. In these later days the Shi'ites, adherents of Ali, tending to mysticism, were even felt by Christians as especially congenial. William of Tyre, writing of the crusades about 1183, knew that those who 'support the traditions of the Egyptians,' called *Siha*, 'nostrae fidei magis consentire videntur,' unlike those who follow the 'superstition of the easterners,' the *Sunni*¹.

The prescence of Ali probably reflects nothing more than his prominence in Shi'ite Mohammedanism. Dante's contemporaries were aware of the differences between the two great sects, that which regards the caliphate as elective and to-day embraces most of the Moslem world, and that which regards it as hereditary and to-day is formed mostly by the Persians. William of Tyre says (p. 916, falsely of course) that 'Hali,' the strongest of the early caliphs, claimed to be greater than Mohammed; that it was to him that Gabriel had really been sent, but had gone to the other through error, and been severely rebuked by the Lord. This had produced a split, 'aliis dicentibus Mehemeth majorem esse, et omnium eximium prophetarum, et hi lingua eorum dicuntur Sunni: aliis dicentibus, Hali solum esse prophetam Domini, et isti dicuntur Ssia.' Some Shi'ites, he adds, even execrated Mohammed. As a matter of fact, to the Sunnites Ali is merely one hero among many, and through them would hardly have made an impression on Dante. To the Shi'ites (without following the chronicler's exaggeration) he is greatest of all next the Prophet himself, pre-eminently the saint, 'the friend of God,' in legend a miracle-worker, to some even a divine incarnation; as the Prophet's cousin, son-in-law and adopted son he and his descendants inherit Mohammed's preternatural authority. His wife Fâtima is the embodiment of the godlike in woman². Though the Fatimite dynasty in Egypt had fallen a century earlier, Shi'ite communities still existed in various parts of western Islam. To Dante, surveying the Moslem world from a distance, Ali was preferable as a man, and he and Mohammed were the two great leaders. Dante pairs them therefore, like Annas and Caiaphas, Ulysses and Diomed, Brutus and Cassius. Possibly his disgust for Mohammed even reflects not only the aversion of Christians, but also the occasional Shi'ite tendency to belittle him shown in William of Tyre. Probably also Ali's position, 'dinanzi,' not 'dietro,' reflects the wrong belief that he was the Prophet's uncle or master, found in Benvenuto, da Buti, Bargigi and Landino, and may be based on Shi'ite ideas. Two final points indicate

¹ *Recueil des Hist. des Crois., Hist. occid.*, I, pp. 15 f.

² Huart, *l.c.*, pp. 284-5. Some Shi'ites have even made him one person in a kind of Moslem trinity. The Western mediæval notion as to a Moslem trinity had some foundation.

knowledge gained by hearsay, as for example through orientalised crusaders or merchants, referred to with bitter scorn just before¹. *Alî* is usually ignored and never conspicuous in the Latin accounts of Mohammed; yet Dante's brief way of mentioning him shows that he was well known. Further, 'ali' was a common Italian noun, more usual in Dante than the modern 'ale,' and of course was accented on the first syllable. But Dante rimes *Alî* with *qui* and *così*. Now *Alî* shows the strong Arabic accent. Dante therefore would seem to have got the name through an Arabic speaker. Very probably he knew the more learned accounts of Mohammed, but got his knowledge and impetus quite as much from common report, especially through the commercial relations between Italy and Egypt or Syria.

J. S. P. TATLOCK.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

¹

Chè ciascun suo nimico era Cristiano,
e nessuno era stato a vincer Acri,
nè mercatante in terra di Soldano.

(*Inf.* xxvii, 88 ff., and cf. v, 60.)

SOPHIE VON LA ROCHE'S VISIT TO ENGLAND IN 1786

IN reading Mr P. S. Matheson's interesting Taylorian lecture of 1930 on German visitors to England between 1770 and 1795¹, which gives an account of the works on England by Moritz, Wendeborn, Archenholz and Lichtenberg, I have been reminded of another record of a stay in England—in some ways more interesting and illuminating than any of these—by a German lady of literary reputation. This is the *Tagebuch einer Reise durch Holland und England* by the 'Verfasserin von Rosaliens Briefe,' Sophie von La Roche. It appears to be quite unknown among us, and it has even escaped the attention of recent German students of its author². The book was published at Offenbach in 1788.

Marie Sophie von La Roche has a niche in every history of German literature, if only as the author of the novel, famous in its day, *Geschichte des Fräuleins von Sternheim*³. She was born at Kaufbeuren on December 6, 1731, as the eldest of the thirteen children of a physician Gutermann of Gutershofen near Augsburg. In 1750 she paid a protracted visit to her grandfather in Biberach who was uncle to the mother of the young poet Wieland. This gave occasion for her inspiring in Wieland, then only seventeen, a passion which echoes through his early writings; but his mother caused dissension and the engagement was broken off. In 1754 Sophie became the wife of a Hofrat at the court of the Elector of Mainz, Georg Michael Frank von La Roche; his real name was Lichtenfels, Wieland's patron, Graf Stadion, who brought him up, being responsible for the change to La Roche. The couple settled first in Mainz; in 1762, they lived in Graf Stadion's house, Castle Wartenhausen near Biberach, where Sophie's friendship with Wieland was renewed, and later, Wieland sponsored with a preface the publication of her first novel, *Fräulein Sternheim*. There were eight children of the marriage of whom three died young; no doubt Sophie's literary activities were largely undertaken to maintain the family after her husband's death. She herself died on February 18, 1807.

¹ *Studies in European Literature, being the Taylorian Lectures*, 2nd Series, Oxford, 1930.

² K. Ridderhoff, *Sophie von La Roche, die Schülerin Richardsons und Rousseaus*, Einbeck, 1895, does not mention it at all. It is, however, I find, discussed by Ludmilla Assing, *Sophie von La Roche, die Freundin Wielands*, Berlin, 1859. See also the article by Erich Schmidt in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, xvii (1883), pp. 717 ff.

³ *Geschichte des Fräuleins von Sternheim*, von einer Freundin derselben aus Original-Papieren und andern zuverlässigen Quellen gezogen. Herausgegeben von C. M. Wieland, 2 Theile, Leipzig, 1771. A reprint, edited by Ridderhoff (with all too numerous misprints) appeared in the *Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, No. 138, in 1907.

The *Geschichte des Fräuleins von Sternheim* is hardly likely to find many readers nowadays outside the circle of specialists or literary historians: but there are many duller eighteenth-century novels, both in England and Germany. Its author belongs to a group of novelists of whom representatives are to be found in every European literature of the time, whose outlook was not entirely bounded by the moral horizon of Richardson, and who had caught a fascinating glimpse of that world of less straitlaced emotions revealed by *La nouvelle Héloïse*. A later work by Sophie von La Roche, *Rosaliens Briefe*¹, the title of which appears as a recommendation on the volume of travel in which we are interested, illustrates better, even if it contains less story, this transitional character of her fiction. Dr Ridderhoff implies that her first book brought her European fame; but this is hardly correct; for, although it was translated into both French and English, it did not bear her name; or rather, it bore Wieland's name on the title-page which led the literary world to suspect a mystification. It was at first generally regarded as a novel by Wieland, and as such it was translated into English². Sophie von La Roche remained herself unknown.

It is not, however, as a novelist, but as a traveller that I am here interested in Sophie von La Roche; and in this capacity she has a number of books to her credit. In 1784 she made a journey to Switzerland, and three years later, gathered together the letters she had written home for the edification of her daughters. They were published as *Tagebuch einer Reise durch die Schweiz* von der Verfasserin von Rosaliens Briefen (Altenburg, 1787). She had not merely a journalistic love of seeking out and interviewing celebrities on her travels, but also a real capacity for making friends. In Switzerland she came into personal touch with Saussure, Mercier, Gibbon, Madame Necker, Bonstetten; and from her book stands out pleasantly an ingratiating picture of the Zürich which, for modern readers, has been immortalised by Gottfried Keller in his delightful *Landvogt von Greifensee*. In the following year, 1785, she paid a visit to Paris and Bordeaux, and the letters from this journey also appeared in 1787 as *Journal einer Reise durch Frankreich*. The chief celebrity whose acquaintance she made on this journey was Buffon. The

¹ *Rosaliens Briefe an ihre Freundin Marianne von St.* Von der Verfasserinn des Fräuleins von Sternheim, Altenburg, 1779-81; a fourth volume appeared at Offenbach in 1791.

² There were two English translations: one by Joseph Collyer, the translator of Klopstock's *Messias*, *The History of Lady Sophia Sternheim*, attempted from the German of Mr Wieland, London, 1776—in the preface, however, it is admitted that the real author is 'one of the most amiable and ingenious ladies of the age.' The other translation, which I have not seen, is: *Memoirs of Miss Sophie Sternheim*, translated by Edward Harwood, 2 vols., London, 1776.

picture she gives of social conditions in Paris on the eve of the great Revolution is exceedingly vivid and might well claim the attention of students of that period. Her third journey was to Holland and England in 1786. Other books of this character were *Briefe über Mannheim* (Mannheim, 1791), *Erinnerungen aus meiner dritten Schweizerreise* (Offenbach, 1793), mainly from the Lake of Geneva, where she sought consolation and recuperation after the death of her son Karl at the age of twenty-three. Lastly, she wrote a *Schattenreise abgeschiedener Stunden von Offenbach nach Weimar und Schönebeck im Jahre 1799* (Leipzig, 1800).

As a traveller Sophie von La Roche was insatiable in her thirst for information, and blessed or cursed by an effusive temperament which lent itself readily to enthusiasm; and for no land was her enthusiasm warmer than for ours. The novels of Richardson had already laid the seeds of her 'Anglomanie,' and a considerable part of *Das Fräulein von Sternheim* plays in this country. She takes her much-tried heroine to Scotland, to Dumfries, 'Tweeddale, Sitz der Grafen von Douglas-March,' and to Lead Hills, the latter a district which would not recognise itself in the picture of Black Country desolation of her description! In 1786, however, she had the opportunity of correcting her imaginings about us; she came to England prepared to find everything beautiful, and regarded us with the kindest and most indulgent eyes.

The interest of Sophie von La Roche's volume does not, of course, lie in its guide-book information which is naturally tedious enough reading, but in the liveliness with which she describes what she sees. As a foreigner, she is struck by many things which stay-at-homes had never thought worth recording; she has a happy knack of narration and a woman's eye for the little things of life. Her comparison of conditions in England with those in France and Germany is particularly interesting, and her book is a testimony to the many advantages we enjoyed over the Continent in the eighteenth century.

On the Dutch portion of her book I do not propose to dwell; but it is also full of warm appreciation. Perhaps the thought that strikes us most here is that Holland's East Indian possessions lent colour to the life of the people and an exotic fragrance to the middle-class Dutch home which was lacking in the drab monotony of Sophie von La Roche's own German towns. And she praises the cleanliness of Holland in terms which makes one think that such cleanliness must have been an unaccustomed sight at home.

The sea barrier which separated England from the Continent in the eighteenth century is vividly brought home to us; crossing the channel was

then something of an adventure. For a week Sophie von La Roche and her fellow-travellers sat at Helvothluys waiting for a favourable wind to make the voyage to Harwich; at last the 'Paquet-Boot' got underway and made the crossing in the unusually short time of forty-eight hours. Unfortunately Sophie was laid prostrate by sea-sickness for most of the time. As a companion she had no less important a personage than the eighty-three years old John Wesley who was returning from a mission to France; and she amusingly describes how, in the arrangement of the sleeping berths round the walls of the cabin, she had the honour of lying with her feet only separated by a thin partition from Wesley's shoulders. She tells us how the old man sat on deck reading Virgil in an Elzevir edition without spectacles.

In spite of her sea-sickness she arrived in Harwich in the most receptive of moods; she expatiates on the English landscape, the Hogarthian figures of the Custom House officers and the marvellous cleanliness and comfort of the English inns. She journeys to London in a private coach on roads the like of which she had never seen, and is filled with amazement at the famous public coach the 'Colchester Maschine' which was passed on the way. Arriving in London on September 5, she first took up her quarters at the 'German Hotel' in Suffolk Street and subsequently moved to rooms in Great Portland Street. She soon discovered that ladies did not walk about the streets of London without hats, and a hat had to be her first purchase. Then began an untiring round of the sights of the town; the museums fill her with admiration and awe; the Tower leads her to fill her pages with English history. She is impressed by the wonderful paving of London streets and the forethought that provided sidewalks for pedestrians; the beauties of St James's Park impress her more than the 'Thuilleries.' 'London ist mehr, viel mehr als Paris in vielen Theilen, und besonders in den nahgelegenen Ortschaften und den bürgerlichen Gebäuden der Stadt. . . . Es ist beinahe unmöglich zu sagen, wie schön alles in London geordnet ist' (pp. 201, 203). Most impressed is she by the magnificence of the London shops which, in her eyes, threw all that she had seen in Paris into the shade; wealth, she tells us, is visibly better distributed in England than it is in France. Particularly vivid is her description of Oxford Street in the evening; its rows of hackney coaches down the middle of the street; its gaily lighted—with marvellous 'Argantische' lamps¹—shops; particularly the confectioners, where large bottles of coloured liqueurs were lighted up by lamps placed behind them, much, I suppose, as is still to be seen in old-fashioned

¹ Argand had introduced his smokeless lamp in London a few years before.

druggists' shops; while the domesticities of their owners could be observed in the upper floors. Chimney-sweeps evoke her admiration; the mode of selling hay in the Haymarket in neatly cut sample bundles impresses her; and the English newspapers—twenty-one in London!—are so interesting that she gives a detailed list of the contents of one of them.

She has much to say on the comfort of English homes, on the forethought in little things, as when she finds in an English bedroom even a 'Säckelchen' provided for her watch. She visits the Theatre Royal in the Haymarket, where the play she sees is *The Disbanded Officer*, the English version by James Johnston of Lessing's *Minna von Barnhelm*; but most noteworthy in her account is not her description of the theatre and its audience or the acting, for which she has high praise, but her tribulations in finding a hackney coach in the rain to bring her home. We find also a vivid description of the interior of 'Satlers Wall' theatre, where she saw what I take to have been a kind of variety programme, 'eine zehnfache Comödie.' She dilates at length on its idyllic surroundings:

Die Gegend dabei ist sehr schön; grosse Wiesen mit Heerden vortrefflicher Kühe belebt; Seen mit Bäumen umpflanzt; vor dem Hause selbst vielfache Alleen, unter deren mit sehr zierlichen Lampen behängten Bäumen nette Tische und Bänke für Gäste stehen. In dem offenen Tempel an der Wiese tanzten bürgerliche Mädchen, Matrosen und andere junge Leute. Wir staunten über die schöne Bauart und die Beleuchtung des Saals, welche in einigen Hundert prächtigen argantischen Lampen bestand, die wirklich die Helle des Sonnenlichtes neben dem Beweis gaben, dass diese Lampen ganz und gar nicht dämpfen (p. 287).

Later she witnessed Mrs Siddons in *Venice Preserved* at Drury Lane:

Mich dünkt, es giebt keine grössere Schauspielerin, noch eine, deren Gestalt mehr für das edle Tragische gestimmt seyn könnte; mehr Wahrheit und unstudirte Grazie kann man nicht denken, viel weniger sehen (p. 533).

The splendours of Ranelagh and Vauxhall are, of course, not forgotten; she delights in the rural beauty of the village of Kensington to which the Londoners betake themselves in summer to enjoy its good air and fine views, while Richmond Park makes her think of Ossian. Deeply impressed, too, is she by the humanitarian spirit of England, as it was to be seen in the provision made for the insane in the hospital of 'Betlam,' then one of the sights of London for the foreigner, and in the wonders of the London 'Findelhaus':

London! dein Findelhaus, die Erziehung deiner Waisen, und die Menschenliebe, welche arme Wöchnerinnen und deine unglücklichen Wahnsinnigen besorgt—sind mir auszeichnende seegenvolle Züge des Edelmuthes, der Weisheit und Grösse!—Du musst Fehlerhaftes haben, weil du von Menschen bewohnt bist, und weil Unvollkommenheit unser allgemeines Loos ist;—aber wie viel Gutes, wie viel Vortreffliches

liegt in dir, unzählbar im Kleinen, und im Grossen für das allgemeine Beste! Seegen meines wohlwollenden Herzens ruhe bis an das Ende der Welt auf dir! (pp. 368 f.).

Sophie von La Roche did not, however, come to England as an unrecommended stranger. She had well-placed relatives in London who provided her with further introductions. These new friends contributed to her entertainment and gained her access to museums and private collections which she might otherwise not have seen. And she had also a friend at court, Madame La Fite, who had translated her *Fräulein von Sternheim* into French¹. This lady was 'reader' to Queen Charlotte, and through her influence Sophie von La Roche was received at Windsor, an incident of which she gives a detailed description. One of her first visits in London had been to Cagliostro—there is a humorous glimpse of the huge negro who managed his house—and here she had met Lord George Gordon of the Gordon Riots fame. Other notabilities who appear in her pages are Sir William Herschel and Lord Monboddo; and towards the end of her stay she spent several days at Beaumont Lodge, where she appears to have reached considerable intimacy with Warren Hastings. Possibly a new biographer of Hastings might find it worth while to read her account of this visit.

From the literary point of view the most interesting of all her English acquaintances was Fanny Burney. Readers of the latter's *Diary* have always been amused by her sprightly description of the 'German baroness.' For the authoress of *Evelina* Sophie von La Roche had unbounded admiration; there was no one in England whom she more desired to meet. It was only, however, with difficulty that Madame La Fite succeeded in inducing Miss Burney to meet the German lady at a little tea party in Windsor. The date was apparently September 11, 1786.

Accordingly (Miss Burney's diary tells us²) I went, and arrived before Madame la Roche. Poor Madame la Fite received me in transport; and I soon witnessed another transport, at least equal, to Madame la Roche, which happily was returned with the same warmth; and it was not till after a thousand embraces, and the most ardent professions—'*Ma digne amie!—est-il possible?—te vois-je?*' etc.—that I discovered they had never met in their lives!—they had corresponded, but no more!

This somewhat lessened my surprise, however, when my turn arrived; for no sooner was I named than all the *embrassades* were transferred to me—'*La digne Miss Burni!—l'auteur de "Cecile" ?—d'"Evelina" ?—non, ce n'est pas possible!—suis je si heureuse!—oui, je le vois à ses yeux!—Ah! que de bonheur!*' etc....

Madame la Roche, had I met her in any other way, might have pleased me in no common degree; for could I have conceived her character to be unaffected, her

¹ *Mémoires de Mademoiselle de Sternheim*, publiés par M. Wieland et traduits de l'Allemand par Madame***, 2 vols., La Haye, 1774.

² *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay*, ed. by Charlotte Barrett, London, 1905, III, pp. 23 ff. Ludmilla Assing, *op. cit.*, also quotes Fanny Burney's opinion of her visitor—naturally with indignation!

manners have a softness that would render her excessively engaging. She is now *bien passée*—no doubt fifty—yet has a voice of touching sweetness, eyes of dove-like gentleness, looks supplicatingly for favour, and an air and demeanour the most tenderly caressing. I can suppose she has thought herself all her life the model of the favourite heroine of her own favourite romance, and I can readily believe that she has had attractions in her youth nothing short of fascinating....

Madame la Fite had told me that she had been only three days in England¹, and had yet made but a beginning of seeing *les spectacles*, and *les gens célèbres*;—and what do you think was the first, and, as yet only *homme célèbre* she had seen—Lord George Gordon!—whom she called *le fameux* George Gordon, and with whom she had dined, in company with Count Cagliostro!

On September 17 they met again:

Madame la Fite began with assuring me of the 'conquest' I had made of Madame la Roche, and appealed to that lady for the truth of what she said. Madame la Roche assured her by rising and throwing her arms about me, and kissing my cheeks from side to side repeatedly. Madame la Fite... opened the next subject by saying that Madame la Roche had read and admired *Cécilie*, again appealing to her for confirmation of her assertion.

'*O, oui, oui!*' cried her friend, '*mais la vraie Cécile, c'est Miss Borni; charmante Miss Borni! digne, douce et aimable!* Coom to me arms! *que je vous embrasse mille fois!*'

Madame la Fite then invited Madame La Roche to tell the story of her life, especially the early part of it in which Wieland was concerned. And Madame La Roche, 'looking down upon her fan,' began the recital.

This narrative was told in so touching and pathetic a manner, and interspersed with so many sentiments of tenderness and of heroism that I could scarcely believe I was not actually listening to a Clelia or a Cassandre, recounting the stories of her youth.... Madame la Roche then, rising, and fixing her eyes filled with tears, in my face, while she held both my hands, in the most melting accents, exclaimed: '*Miss Borni! la plus chère, la plus digne des Anglais! dites-moi—m'aimez-vous?*'

If we turn now to Sophie von La Roche's volume we find her version of these meetings. Here is her impression of Fanny Burney:

Sie dünkete Euern Bruder und mich ein wahres Ideal von Gestalt, Bildung, Ausdruck, Kleidung und Bezeugen zu seyn. Ich glaube, die Feinheit des Geistes, und Sanftmuth des Charakters, welche aus ihr hervorleuchten, können nie übertroffen werden. Sie, und die beiden Damen, sprechen vollkommen französisch. Der Abend war durch diese Gefälligkeit für mich sehr schön, weil ich im Englischen unvollkommen bin, und also Vieles von dem verloren hätte, was neben den so schönen Handarbeiten gesprochen wurde (p. 373).

And on the second occasion:

Miss Burney, wie ich das erstmal sie beschrieb, Ideal einer englischen Miss: Scharfsinn, Sanftmuth, feines Gefühl, Tugendliebe und Menschenkenntniß, so vereint, jede dieser Eigenschaften so vollkommen, und doch von ihr mit einer Zurückhaltung regiert, dass sie nur, wie die Erscheinungen lebenswürdiger Geister, zu gemessener Zeit, und nur Augenblicke sich zeigen (p. 405).

Die ganze Unterredung mit Miss Burney war mir äusserst angenehm, und gewiss bleibt es zweifelhaft, ob die Anmuth ihrer Person, die Kenntnisse ihres Geistes, oder ihre Bescheidenheit den Vorzug verdiene; sicher wird aber jede edeldenkende und vernünftige Seele sich freuen, sie zu kennen, und sich in ihrem Umgang glücklich

¹ In reality she had been a week in England.

finden. Bei meinen Betrachtungen über sie fand ich in dem wenigen Englisch, so ich spreche, doch den ihren Eigenschaften angemessenen Ausdruck! Darling of virtue! Liebling der Tugend! (p. 387).

It may reasonably be supposed that Sophie von La Roche's enthusiasm would have been more subdued, had she had a glimpse into her idol's *Diary* in which the visit is chronicled for the delectation of posterity.

On October 12 Sophie took sorrowful farewell of England at Dover:

Adieu, England! Sey immer so schön, als ich dich sah—und so gut, als ich dich glaubte! Windsor! Richmond! nie, nie werde ich euch vergessen! (p. 612).

Her stay in England thus extended over a little more than a month.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

NOTES ON THE WORD 'GAR-SECG'¹.

This word is very generally used in Old English literature, both in poetry and prose, as a term for the ocean. It is most commonly used to represent the wide expanse of ocean and as such translates 'oceanus' in Alfred's *Orosius*. It is found as early as Cædmon's *Genesis* in poetry, but if its use in poetry is as a kenning, it must have quickly lost this poetic sense in its rapid passage into prose.

Theories about the origin of the word hitherto proposed have not been accepted as convincing. The least plausible, from a phonological point of view, is that of Sweet who would derive it from 'gas-ric' ('raging creature'), where 'gas-' is cognate with O.N. 'geisa,' and '-ric' a common suffix. Since this form occurs in the Franks Casket inscription, it is scarcely possible that it could have undergone such a violent phonological development by the period of Cædmon and *Beowulf*.

The second theory is but little more convincing. This derives the form from 'gar-secg' ('spear-(shaped) sedge'), where, by a sort of metonymy, the sedge growing at the side of the sea comes to designate the sea itself. To substantiate this, two facts may be cited: (1) that the rippling spear-shaped sedge resembled the crests of waves; (2) that such names as 'gar-clife' ('agrimony') and 'gar-leac' ('garlic') are used to distinguish plants with long, sharp-pointed leaves. But the general use in Old English prose seems to make the acceptance of this very poetic origin doubtful; here we should have a poetic conception of some beauty, when regarded as metonymy, passing into common prosaic use, whereas the special vocabulary of poetic kennings rarely left its purely poetic contexts.

The third theory was, until recently, generally discredited. This says that 'gar-secg' ('spear-man') represents some kind of sea-god akin to

¹ Professor Parry-Williams of University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, has supplied the following note:

'Now the point is this: "gaseg," being the second element of the compound, has undergone soft (or "voiced") mutation, i.e., the initial "c" has been voiced to "g." The radical form is, of course, "caseg." If one had an O.E. form with the first element (*mor-sea*) borrowed as well as the second, i.e., a whole compound, one would be on safer ground in comparing or connecting the Welsh mutated form "gaseg" with his O.E. word...

'Then, supposing the mutated form "gaseg" (which naturally cannot stand by itself without something before it to cause the mutation) was borrowed, what would be the pronunciation in the seventh and eighth centuries? It would undoubtedly be practically the same as at the present day, because it is now agreed that most of the sound changes in individual words... had taken place before the end of the seventh century at the latest.'

Neptune; but it has been pointed out that Teutonic mythology has no such figure connected with such a symbol.

But in a recent article entitled *Terms and Phrases for the Sea in Old English Poetry* Miss H. T. McM. Buckhurst recurs to this theory in suggesting of 'gar-secg' that: 'it is one instance among the Old English terms for the sea, of a mythological type of kenning so frequent in O.N. Skaldic verse....'

Interesting in this connexion is the form 'Torngarsuk,' used for a sea deity by the inhabitants of Greenland according to Crantz's *History of Greenland* (quoted by Lang in *Myth, Ritual and Religion*, vol. II). This Torngarsuk, a male monster, had a female counterpart who dwelt in a cave under the sea, suggesting in this and in other significant details a link with the Grendel legend. If, however, Crantz is correct in his etymology, Torngarsuk, probably a non-Aryan word, has no essential connexion with the sea. It is rather presumptuous to cite this form as a cognate in support of the theory of 'gar-secg' as a sea deity. Nor can the idea of 'gar-secg' being a mythological kenning, unique in Old English poetry, gain unqualified support.

I propose a theory of a Celtic origin which has some good claims. There is a form 'Mor-gaseg' in Welsh which is used to denote a 'sea-breaker,' but which literally means 'sea-mare.' Not only has this form a striking phonological resemblance to the form 'gar-secg,' but it indicates a form of imagery known to, and appreciated by, the early English. Such forms as 'sae-mearh,' 'sae-hengest' and 'mere-hengest' are commonly used in Old English poetry to designate ships. The similar imagery of the Celtic form might explain the borrowing, whereupon the form, entering the context of sea ideas, soon became adapted to the English mind, but, losing its original specialised significance, acquired a false etymological form ('gar-secg') and became merely a useful general term for the sea.

Enquiries into the possibility of such a borrowing have resulted in the discovery that phonologically the form was much the same in the seventh century as it is to-day.

The only real difficulty lies in the fact that as 'gaseg' is a mutated form of 'caseg,' it could only have been borrowed in some compounded form where a prefix would mutate the initial 'c' to 'g.' Such a compound as 'mor-gaseg,' where 'mor' sea, is an example. But surely we can say, plausibly enough, that the first element of this compound was dropped soon after the borrowing because of its unfamiliarity or its confusing association with O.E. 'mor' moor.

At any rate we have the two general supporting factors of phonological resemblance and similarity of meaning and imagery for this origin; the question of date provides no difficulties, while some inter-marriage must surely have followed the Saxon invasions resulting in the entry of some Celtic words into Old English.

On several grounds, therefore, this theory of the origin of the form. is more plausible than those preceding.

WM. J. REDBOND.

LONDON.

A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON JOHN DRYDEN.

Dryden, perhaps more than any other English poet, has suffered in the treatment of his biographers because of their incomplete knowledge concerning a most important aspect of his life—his finances. Since Malone's biography of the poet in 1800, there have been conjectures, charges, recriminations, defences. But none of his biographers has been able, completely, to indicate Dryden's true financial condition, especially during the tense years 1679–85.

In the year of the Restoration, Dryden found himself in London faced with the problem of making his own way. A clever young man of twenty-nine, with years of wide reading behind him and endowed with uncommon ability, he turned to the stage as a quick and, for him, easy avenue to fame. But before he had produced more than one play he had married, in December, 1663, Lady Elizabeth Howard, a sister of Sir Robert Howard and daughter of Thomas Howard, Earl of Berkshire. With this marriage begins the matter of his finances.

In 1662 Lady Elizabeth, apparently in recognition of her father's services to the king, had been granted £3000 to be paid out of the excise at the rate of £250 quarterly until it should all be paid¹. But in June, 1666, the fact is recorded that it had not been paid². Thus far the biographers have traced the grant; Christie says that 'it may be presumed that it was ultimately paid and added to Dryden's fortune³.' I cannot vouch for the truth of the last half of the presumption, but the first part is certainly true. With the help of her brother, Sir Robert, she was finally granted a payment of £500 on September 19, 1667⁴; another for a like amount on August 12, 1668⁵, and on the next day, August 13, an additional payment of £523. 10s. 1d.⁶ Thus, in six years, after many

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1661–2, p. 288.

² *Ibid.*, 1665–6, p. 459.

³ *Poetical Works of John Dryden*, ed. W. D. Christie, London, 1902, Introductory Memoir, p. xxv.

⁴ *Calendar of Treasury Books*, II, 1667–8, p. 186.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 607.

petitions to the Treasury Lords, she had received £1818. 15s. 7d. In August, 1669, a warrant for £657. 14s. 4½d. discharged in full the grant of £3000¹. If we like, we too may presume that these payments were added to Dryden's small fortune.

Just how large that fortune was at this time, I do not know. Malone² estimates that between 1665 and 1670 Dryden's income was £200 a year, divided as follows: £40 from part of a landed estate in his native Northamptonshire³; £60 from an estate in Wiltshire which his father-in-law settled upon him at his marriage; and £100 from the theatre. Malone reckoned the total income equal to £600 in 1800; to-day, at a conservative estimate, it would probably be equal to £1200.

For the sake of convenience we may regard 1670 as the end of the first period in this study of his finances. In this year begins the problem of his payments as Poet Laureate and Royal Historiographer—a position which brought in £200 a year. Appointed on April 13, 1668⁴, he received no payment for more than two years. Then on January 27, 1670–71 he received a grant of £500, salary for two years and a half, retroactive from his appointment⁵. This payment discharged the obligation of Charles II to Dryden from June, 1668, to Christmas, 1670. Thereafter, until February, 1676–7, payments were made quite regularly, as follows: on April 20, 1672, £200⁶; on March 10, 1672–3, £200; on December 31, 1673, £200; on December 4, 1674, £200; on February 28, 1675–6, £100; on February 20, 1676–7, £200⁷. At this time the king was but a half year in arrears in the payments to his Poet Laureate.

During this period, 1670–7, the second as we may call it, Dryden prospered. In addition to the £100 from his estates, he received the pension of £200 as I have indicated. The income from his writing is purely conjectural. Two years before his payments as Poet Laureate began, that is, in 1668, he had contracted to write three plays a year for the King's Company. In return he received a share and a quarter of the profits of the theatre. In a memorial written about 1678, Dryden's fellow-shareholders complained that the poet had failed to produce the three plays a year, although he continued to receive for his share and a quarter 'three or four hundred pounds' a year⁸. Malone, believing that

¹ *Ibid.*, 1669–72, p. 265.

² *The Prose Works of John Dryden*, ed. Edmund Malone, London, 1800, I, pp. 441 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 440.

⁴ *State Papers Domestic*, 1667–8, p. 341.

⁵ *Calendar of Treasury Books*, IV, 1669–72, p. 772.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1227.

⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 1672–5, pp. 81, 453, 626; V, pp. 139, 552.

⁸ Quoted by Malone, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

the value of a share was exaggerated, reduced it to £200 a year. Taking his conservative figure, we may, with some assurance, believe that during these years Dryden's total income was £500 or more.

Thus far there has been little difficulty in following the finances of the poet. From 1677 to 1685, however, they become more complicated. These are important years for Dryden's reputation; the events of these years, misunderstood and misinterpreted by none too sympathetic critics, have all but blasted the reputation of the poet.

There are two matters of paramount importance; first, the irregularity—or supposed irregularity—of the payments on his pension; second, the grant of an additional pension of £100 per year, upon which Macaulay based his charge of apostasy against Dryden.

Macaulay was, of course, using only the facts as then known upon which to build his accusation. Malone¹ in 1800 and Scott² in 1808 both assert that the £100 a year was added to his pension after the death of Charles. Macaulay, upon this evidence, makes his own interpretation; and for years Dryden's conversion to Catholicism was thought to have depended upon a money grant. This misinterpretation, however, was destroyed in the middle of the last century by the discovery of a document which showed that Dryden's additional £100 had been granted before 1680; but how long before has not been definitely known³. I have found an item, dated July 2, 1677, which reads: 'Mr Dryden to have another £100 per annum added to his £200 per annum as Poet Laureate⁴.' Thus, eight years before his conversion, Dryden's additional pension had been granted.

Charles had indeed been open-handed with his Poet Laureate; there was only one limitation to his generosity; he neglected to pay anything to Dryden, either on the old pension or on the new, for a year and a half. The regularity of the payments up to 1677 was now destroyed; the arrears of which Dryden complained years later were now beginning. In June, 1678, payment was resumed—a half year's salary for a year and a half⁵.

The next year was lean: on July 4, 1679, he received one quarter's salary for a year⁶. On December 22, 1679, he received another quarter's stipend, £75; on June 17, 1680, £75; on December 16 of the same year, £50; on June 28, 1681, £100; on January 12, 1681–2, £75; on August 28,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 449: 'from 1685 to 1689... his salary was increased to £300 a year.'

² *Works of John Dryden*, ed. Scott-Saintsbury, I, p. 270: on March 4, 1685–6.

³ Quoted by Saintsbury, *loc. cit.*, pp. 248–9.

⁴ *Calendar of Treasury Books*, v, p. 462.

⁵ *Ibid.*, v, p. 1017.

⁶ *Ibid.*, vi, p. 121.

1682, £75; on March 10, 1682-3, £75; on August 22, 1683, £75; on May 6, 1684, £75; on December 15, 1684, £150¹. Thus the payments were made until 1685, usually two grants in a year, the money totalling only a half year's salary. In this manner the arrears accumulated, until in 1685 payments were four years late. But after the accession of James in this year all was changed. It is true, so far as I can discover, that the payments due to Dryden for four years were wiped from the slate; but it is also true that from August 18, 1685, to July 6, 1688, the payments were made regularly as follows: on August 18, 1685, £150; on February 20, 1685-6, £150; on September 30, 1686, £225; on March 12, 1686-7, £150; on June 28, 1687, £150; on October 25, 1687, £75; on January 17, 1687-8, £75; on April 4, 1688, £75; on July 6, 1688, £75².

That Dryden had a just complaint against Charles cannot be gainsaid; but that he was almost a pauper, as he and some of his biographers have suggested, I can scarcely believe. It is true that his income was severely reduced, in spite of the additional bounty of Charles; but upon examination we shall find his income for this period, 1677-85, somewhat as follows: from the theatre, £100³; from his landed estates, £100⁴; from his pension, an average income of £180 per year—a total of about £380 per year. This is scarcely pauperism; indeed, it is nearly double his income during the years 1662-70. Christie's treatment of these arrears indicates the prevalent misunderstanding: 'An exchequer warrant, dated May 6, 1684, proves that Dryden's salary had not then been paid since Lady Day, 1680, nor his additional pension of £100 a year since January of the same year⁵.' It proves nothing of the sort: it simply means that he was receiving a payment four years behind time. As a matter of fact, during those four years Dryden had received £400 on his salary and £175 on the additional pension.

Thus, I have attempted to disentangle the pension payments before the Revolution. If we simplify the record of these grants, Dryden's income from various sources will appear approximately as follows: during his early career, £200 yearly; between 1670 and 1677, when his pension was paid regularly, £500; between 1677 and 1685, the years of Charles's carelessness, £380; and from 1685 to 1688, more than £400. Undoubtedly, with the greater obligations of the passing years, Dryden had good reason to beg the king for his income. Nevertheless, his total income, even at its lowest, does not suggest destitution. In all likelihood Dryden knew

¹ *Ibid.*, vi, pp. 318, 576; vii, pp. 197, 364, 588, 736, 897, 1117, 1450.

² *Ibid.*, viii, pp. 309, 604, 914, 1256, 1429, 1562, 1714, 1845, 1985.

³ Malone, *op. cit.*, p. 448.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 448.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. liv.

his man and found it expedient policy to bombard the king with demands. The poet's real financial distress, as is well known, occurred after the Revolution.

CHARLES E. WARD.

DURHAM, N. CAROLINA.

'MR KRISTROM' IN BOSWELL'S 'LIFE OF DR JOHNSON.'

In his *Life of Johnson* Boswell describes how, in the course of a visit to his friend and master on March 23, 1772,

we were interrupted by the entrance of Mr. Kristrom, a Swede, who was tutor to some young gentleman in the city. He told me that there was a very good History of Sweden, by Daline. Having at that time an intention of writing the history of that country, I asked Dr. Johnson, whether one might write a history of Sweden, without going thither. 'Yes Sir, (said he,) one for common use.'

The conversation of the three men then passed to languages.

This Swede has, so far, not been identified by students of Johnson; and as he is not without interest for the study of Anglo-Swedish intellectual relations, some account of him may be welcome. There is no doubt that he was a certain Pehr Chriström who is known to have lived in London as a pensioned tutor in the early eighties of the eighteenth century.

Pehr Chriström was born in 1706 at Kristianstad, in the province of Scania. Although his father had only a subordinate post in the Customs, the boy was sent to the Latin school, and in the spring of 1725 he matriculated at the University of Lund. During the first century of the history of this university most of the students, and especially those who came from the northern provinces, lived in extreme poverty. This was, no doubt, the real reason why Chriström's studies extended over so long a period; he had probably to give private lessons to gain his daily bread. Among the many subjects a student of that time had to master in order to pass the examination in philosophy, he took a special interest in mathematics and oriental languages, the study of the latter being particularly flourishing at many of the Protestant universities. In the eighteenth century there were many distinguished orientalists in Sweden, especially at Lund, and among these Henric Benzelius, Johan Engeström, Jacob Jonas Björnstål and Matthias Norberg enjoyed European fame. The professor of Greek and oriental languages in Chriström's time, Johan Engeström, was his sincere friend and patron.

After great difficulties, mostly financial, Chriström graduated in 1738; and thus acquired the academic status which was the formal condition for a university post. Notwithstanding the great favour which many of

the professors showed him, he had to work hard and long for his advancement in this academic career. During the following years he tried unsuccessfully for several posts, notably for the chair of mathematics at the University of Greifswald. Subsequently he studied for a time in Berlin. Soon after his return to Sweden he became tutor in the house of Baron Sjöbladh, governor of the province of Malmöhus. But he did not abandon his hope of an academic position and in 1744 he was appointed docent. He did not, however, take up the duties of this post, and in June, 1744, he left Sweden.

His destination was England. What particular motive he may have had in his choice we do not know. Germany, Holland and France were at this time most favoured by Swedes travelling abroad for study; but during the first half of the eighteenth century England, where the natural sciences and philology were particularly flourishing, became increasingly attractive.

Chriström's interest in England may, however, have been influenced by those around him. Carl Jesper Benzelius, later Bishop of Strängnäs, who was one of Chriström's younger fellow-students, went to England in 1739 to pursue his studies in oriental languages. Petrus Filenius, who was appointed professor at the University of Lund in 1742, had visited Oxford some years before. And Chriström's patron Baron Sjöbladh must have had connexions with England. Sjöbladh's father as a young man had completed his education by visiting England, and after entering the English army, remained there for thirteen years.

Chriström did not intend to stay long abroad; but he was never to return. He obtained a good situation as tutor in London, but he seems to have mixed little with his compatriots in the Swedish colony. The register of the Swedish Church does not give any information about him, and it is useless to search for his name in the more famous Swedish diaries of travel in England about the middle of the eighteenth century. Kalm, Lidén, Björnsthål, and Troili, the chief Swedes who visited England at this time, and who all took a lively interest in the Swedish colony, and gave detailed lists of their countrymen in London, do not seem to have met him. But his name is to be found in the 'List of Swedes living in or around the capital of London,' which was published by Görwell in his review *Adressen*, No. 38, in 1775. This list was sent from London in 1774 by Johannes Gothenius, one of the teachers of the famous Swedish writer Thomas Thorild, who himself made an interesting journey to England in 1788-90. Gothenius was one of the most prominent Swedish Biblical critics of his time; and as a member of the committee

for the translation of the Bible, he made a journey to England in 1774, his principal object being, to quote from the *Nya lärda Tidningar*, 'to visit Kennicot, the famous English exegete and consult with him about the right nature of the original text of the Old Testament.' Gothenius also went to London, where he met Chriström. The interesting diary of his journey, which he sent to Giörrwell in the form of letters, was published in Giörrwell's *Samlaren*. It contains the following characteristic account of the old orientalist:

I was very anxious to see Master Chriström, an old philologist: I heard him give a lecture at the University of Lund in the early 'forties; for twenty-eight years he has been here and he lives very nicely on his £100, which he will receive every year as long as he lives from the rich Jew, whose sons he taught and thereafter accompanied during several years on their journeys in Southern Europe. He is sixty-nine years old and lives a contented life but is not very satisfied with a new Swedish translation of the Bible or with any critical views on it; he gives the old reasons¹.

We can only guess how Chriström made the acquaintance of Dr Johnson. Their common philological interests may have brought them together. It is not, however, out of the question that their friendly intercourse may have been more intimate than Boswell indicates. The way in which the latter mentions him seems to imply that Chriström did not come as a stranger, at least as far as the host was concerned.

I should like to bring up the question whether Chriström may not have been the Swedish learned man who, according to a letter of November 28, 1754, from Johnson to Thomas Warton, presented Johnson with a Finnish dictionary. And when Dr Johnson mentions in another letter, written on Christmas Eve, 1757, that he had been promised a kind notice of his dictionary in Sweden, it is tempting to presume that Chriström may have acted as intermediary. The fact that Chriström came from the country of Charles XII, whom Dr Johnson so highly admired, may also have helped to strengthen the bond between the famous English literary man and the humble Swedish philologist.

HARALD ELOVSON.

LUND.

¹ *Samlaren*, Sjette Delen, Stockholm, 1774, p. 660.

REVIEWS

The Phoenix Nest, 1593. Edited by HYDER E. ROLLINS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xliv + 242 pp. 21s.

Professor Hyder E. Rollins's edition of *The Phoenix Nest* is as careful and thorough as might be expected of his work. The text reproduces the original page for page, line for line, type for type and, with certain puzzling exceptions, letter for letter. The exceptions are indeed so puzzling as to be unaccountable: there are, as Professor Rollins points out, nine unmistakable verbal misprints, of which he corrects five in the text. But if five, why not all nine; or, since he comments duly on all nine in the notes, why should he correct any? It is an odd inconsistency. The index too is not as consistent as it might have been: e.g. *coolice* (p. 37 of the original edition) is given as a variant under *cullis*, without cross-reference, yet *cætera*, surely more obvious and scarcely needing comment, is given separately and referred to *cetera*. Professor Rollins's recognition (p. xiv) of the difficulty of attaining complete accuracy should, however, earn a lenient judgment for his own slips.

The notes are full of learning and usually illuminating, if sometimes a little too ingenious. An example may be cited from the note on the 4th stanza of *Faine to content*:

You are the Pharos whereto now retire,
My thoughts long wandring in a forren coast,
In you they liue, to other ioyes they die,
And liuing draw their foode from your faire eie.

Professor Rollins (pp. 157-8) explains 'Pharos' as referring to the tyrannous Pharaoh of the Exodus. But apart from the consideration that Pharos can hardly be a singular form, the reference is entirely out of place. The poet is not here complaining of cruelty: he is comparing the lady to the lighthouse, the Pharos, to which his wandering thoughts return after their long voyage. It is even possible that the reference to the Pharos leads on to the 'faire eie' of the last line. The transition is not unnatural, and there is an exact parallel to this association of lighthouse and lambent eyes in Sylvester (trans. of Du Bartas, II, IV, v, Trophies 894):

Their eyes sweet splendor seems a Pharos bright.

One must protest also, though for different reasons, against the note (p. 186) on the lines:

As ioy of ioyes, and neuer dying blis,
Is to behold that mightie powre diuine,
Nor may we craue more blessednes than this,
With face to face, to see his glorie shine,
So heere on earth, the onely good I finde
Is your sweete sight, my whole content of minde.

'That mightie powre diuine' Professor Rollins declares to be 'an extremely vague remark, which might apply either to the sun or to Love.' The poet is, on the contrary, making a bold and definite comparison between the heavenly bliss of the Beatific Vision and the earthly bliss of the sight of his lady.

And, finally, Professor Rollins seems to miss the full sense when he cites (p. 190), as parallels to

When iust cause of sorrowing doth faile,
I waile in fine, bicause I cannot waile,

passages, such as Gray's sonnet on West, where poets lament that they weep the more because they weep in vain. But weeping in vain is not the same as inability or want of excuse to weep. The true, though comic, parallel to the over-refined sentiment here is King Gama's fury at having nothing whatever to grumble at. But all parallels are unnecessary, since the poet, like a good Elizabethan, is borrowing from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (II, 796):

Vixque tenet lacrymas; quia nil lacrymabile cernit.

There are other differences of opinion between editor and reviewer which must remain differences of opinion, not to be argued about. These are more serious objections, and are put forward with greater frankness because of the pleasure, perhaps slightly malicious, given by Professor Rollins's firm handling (pp. 161-2 and 194-5) of a kind of perverted criticism of which he is happily incapable.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

A Second Elizabethan Journal. By G. B. HARRISON. London: Constable. 1931. xii + 401 pp. 24s.

This second instalment of Dr Harrison's 'record of things most talked about' covers the years 1595-8, the first *Elizabethan Journal* having chronicled the years 1591-4. Dr Harrison has worked on the same lines in this as in the earlier volume, using in the main the same classes of sources, the result being another very readable book, for which we are grateful. The project was bold, and was bound to lay its execution open both to quibbling and to legitimate criticism. But Dr Harrison's determination to let nothing enter into his record but what has documentary authority is certainly the proper basis for any such attempt.

He has notable qualifications for the task. Few, if any, scholars can have used the Stationers' Register to better purpose and have profited by its indications to attain a wider acquaintance with the obscurer printed literature of the Elizabethan Age for the purpose of this work. And it would be unreasonable to demand of the same person an equally curious and full knowledge of original manuscript records, though here also Dr Harrison has ranged widely. Yet, to take an obvious instance, he might well have followed up such a striking hint as that given in the Acts of the Privy Council concerning Barnabe Barnes and his poisoning of John Brown. He would have found a full account of a *cause célèbre*,

which must have given all London much food for gossip in all its vivid details, in the records of Star Chamber. Or, again, search in Chancery records for the Great Carrack (p. 18, and *Elizabethan Journal*) would have led him to realise how the London citizens were affected by this capture and how it led to bitter quarrels of some duration. Incidentally, he would have learned how Abraham Cocks, pilot and master of the *Assurance*, deserted the Earl of Cumberland's fleet and went aboard the *Golden Dragon*, homeward bound from the West Indies, taking with him booty worth £200 from the newly captured Carrack.

It is, of course, a pretty question what matters were indeed most talked about. I am convinced, for example, that the war in the Netherlands has received disproportionate space, in a book thus conceived, as distinguished from official history, especially in the first volume. On the other hand, there is no mention, in the first volume, of the 'great windy Thursday' of 1593, which was a landmark in the memories of Londoners, and by which they dated other events. There is again the question of talk in the capital as against provincial interests. It is evident that there is difficulty in covering the provinces, though Dr Harrison has kept the Borders in mind (he has not, I gather, used the fascinating Border Papers), and has related many a provincial episode from printed pamphlets. An admirable reflection of the interests of a country vicar may be found in his *obiter dicta* recorded in the parish register of Rolleston in Nottinghamshire during these years. And there may be others. It is a difficulty inherent in the very project, and Dr Harrison is obliged, of course, to a restricted selection. The fact is, no doubt, that the record of a single year might well, on this plan, fill a series of volumes, and Dr Harrison must have had many a pang of regret as he proceeded with his necessary eliminations.

No reader can study this book without both pleasure and profit, and it will help to an understanding of Elizabethan literature, the purpose to which Dr Harrison rightly dedicates his labours. But I am very chary of the search for topical references in explanation of Shakespeare's plays or his characters. There is, for example, no need to refer Jaques in *As You Like It* to *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (p. 351). The spellings *Jaques* and *Jakes* are frequently to be found indiscriminately used in manuscript documents, and the name is not uncommon in them. There were English merchants trading with Spain under the French alias of De Bois, but I should not think it necessary to seek this explanation of the use of a common French name in the same play. Nor do I incline to see in *Troilus and Cressida* a picture of Essex as Achilles, or to date the play on this assumption (p. 369). Dr Harrison, when quoting Nashe on Harvey in the year 1597, might have remembered his own note: 'Nashe, especially when malicious, is quite unreliable' (p. 342). As the quotation stands (p. 146), it would seem to hold for the Harvey of 1597, whereas what Nashe has to say goes back twenty years to Harvey's undergraduate days.

I am a little puzzled to know why the abbreviation *A.R.* is used for the Stationers' Register, in place of the accepted *S.R.*, which is universally

understood to mean Arber's transcript. I have found the index occasionally inadequate, but it is a difficult book to index in reasonable space. The entry 'Sommers, Will' is surely darkening counsel with a resemblance to Henry VIII's fool Will Summers. The Nottingham boy in question is nowhere called 'Will' in the text, and other Williams in the index remain 'William.' I have observed one unfortunate misprint on p. 332. In *Alba: the mouth's mind of a melancholy lover, for mouth's read month's*.

Students of Elizabethan life and literature will certainly look forward to the continuation of Dr Harrison's stimulating and illuminating work.

CHARLES J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Shakespeare's Problem Comedies. By W. W. LAWRENCE. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan. 1931. ix + 259 pp. 12s. 6d.

Professor Lawrence has written a book which should be read by all students of Shakespeare and by all who themselves write upon Shakespeare. To advise the reading of yet another book upon Shakespeare is a recommendation not to be made lightly, in days when the subject is being unmercifully exploited. But here is the work of a mediæval scholar of the highest distinction applying his knowledge and his historical sense to the interpretation of such difficult plays as *All's Well* or *Troilus and Cressida*, and the result is an indispensable book, the dedication of which to A. C. Bradley is entirely appropriate.

Among the most illuminating of approaches to Shakespeare is that which seeks to interpret his plays in the light of the material used by him which he inherited from earlier generations, much of it coming to birth in the Middle Ages and bearing upon it the impress of mediæval thought and manners. Professor Lawrence has concerned himself here with this aspect of that most valuable part of source-study which seeks not only facts but significances, and considers the plays in question in relation to the older material which came into Shakespeare's workshop and which perforce played its part in moulding the finished product. The approach in itself is, of course, not new, as Professor Lawrence himself insists. But, as practised by him, it leads to a far more complete understanding of what he, following Dr Boas, calls the Problem Plays, than can be attained by any other road. And he has set an admirable example for the further exploitation of this method of study.

The term Problem Play is perhaps not altogether satisfactory, and it is arguable that all Shakespeare's plays are in one sense or another problem plays. It might well be pointed out that *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* offers precisely similar 'problems' to those of *All's Well*. But it is so much to the good that the term is here definitely withdrawn from that improper and misleading use of it which would turn certain plays of Shakespeare into dramatic treatises on Jealousy, Ambition, or Pessimism. Professor Lawrence rightly insists that the story is the thing, and that from this fundamental fact much follows of supreme importance in considering *All's Well*, for instance. When to the weight of the in-

herited material we add the weight of inherited and surviving tradition and ways of thought in the Elizabethan Age, which 'no Chinese wall separated from the Middle Ages,' as Professor Lawrence remarks, we are helped to shed modern preconceptions and to approach the play with intelligence and understanding.

So, for example, Professor Lawrence demurs to any such want of sympathy with Helena as we find in the views of the *New Cambridge* editors, or their notion of *All's Well* as 'a rather nasty play,' or the conception of Isabella in *Measure for Measure* as 'a base procuress.' Oddly enough, however, he shares their contempt for the dialogue which Parolles holds with Helena, which seems to me both pithy and significant. There is, perhaps, a tendency in the book to respect, and even to accept, views which have attained currency and have authoritative sponsors, even though in some instances Professor Lawrence really knows better himself. A striking instance may perhaps be found in his treatment of the last act of *Troilus and Cressida*. He assumes as an established fact that scenes iv-x are spurious (pp. 125, 135, 161, 165). Yet he realises that the conclusion of the play is its crown: 'there is nothing else in Shakespearian comedy just like the spirit of these closing scenes' which 'carry steadily to the end the relentless logic of the play, the searching analysis of a reflective criticism of life' (pp. 168-9). Indeed he himself quotes a characteristically Shakespearian passage from one of the 'spurious' scenes (p. 168). And no small part of the value of his treatment of the play lies precisely in his vindication of its conclusion.

On textual matters, indeed, Professor Lawrence does not offer guidance, and he has not entered into such problems as are raised with respect to two of the plays in the group, *All's Well* and *Measure for Measure*, by Professor Dover Wilson in the *New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Yet such questions must enter into the final discussion of the plays in reference to the arguments of Professor Lawrence. The views of Professor Lowes concerning the nature of the revision of *All's Well*, for example, are found to be significant (p. 62) for Professor Lawrence's purpose.

I have observed only one misprint, *psuedo* for *pseudo* (p. 10). I must once more protest against that most disagreeable arrangement of Notes which groups them at the end of the book under chapters with fresh numerical series for each chapter, with no running headline to assist the reader. It is unfortunate that typographical convenience should put obstacles in the way of studying and enjoying so excellent a book, which is in other respects admirably produced. I think it is reasonably certain that Heywood's *Iron Age* postdates *Troia Britannica* and could not possibly 'antedate Shakespeare's work' (p. 155). The stanzaic *Life and Death of Hector* (1614) is beyond question not by Heywood (*ibid.*). I suggest that Professor Lawrence might have laid more stress in his treatment of *Troilus and Cressida* on the mediæval distortion of the Troy story in the interests of the Trojans. Shakespeare's caricature of the Greeks, as compared with his portraits of Trojans (pp. 140-1), is a solid inheritance from tradition and practice, and a reflection of current popular ideas.

Finally, the readers of this book are bound, it seems to me, to turn back to Professor Lawrence's preface, in which he sets forth his original project for a work of a larger and more general scope in this field, and to form lively hopes of his return to that project, which he is so admirably qualified to fulfil.

CHARLES J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Shakespeare versus Shallow. By LESLIE HOTSON. London: Nonesuch Press. 1931. 375 pp. 12s. 6d.

Hunting for records of Shakespeare is a heart-breaking and not very profitable game that is played mainly by American professors, to whom naturally and very properly the plums usually fall. The skill and perseverance of Professor Hotson have been rewarded by the discovery that in the autumn of 1596 one William Wayte swore the peace against William Shakespeare, Francis Langley, and two unknown women, and this fact has been elaborated to the extent of a hundred and thirty pages. The other two-thirds of his volume are occupied by extracts and transcripts of the documents he has come across in the course of his search, for naturally so promising a find led to further investigation. William Wayte proved to be the step-son and creature of an ambitious and rather unscrupulous Surrey justice by name William Gardiner. Francis Langley was of course the owner of the Swan Theatre on Bankside, and since it appears that shortly before he had himself sworn the peace against Gardiner and Wayte, and was moreover being prosecuted for slander, it is reasonable to assume that he was the protagonist in the quarrel, whatever it may have been. In any case no further evidence whatever has come to light to implicate Shakespeare, and when Mr Hotson more than once alludes to Gardiner's 'violent quarrel' with him, he is speaking altogether beyond his brief. The presence of Shakespeare and the two women in company with Langley on the occasion of his alleged threats to Wayte would probably account for the appearance of their names, and even if the poet did take a more active part in the affair, there is still no evidence that he ever met, knew, or cared two straws about Justice Gardiner.

The writ of attachment pursuant on Wayte's seeking sureties of the peace was directed to the sheriff of Surrey, from which Mr Hotson infers that Shakespeare was at the time resident in that county, probably in Southwark. I am not a legal historian, and I should hesitate to pronounce whether or not the inference is valid: but, seeing that Langley was probably the person mainly implicated and that his playhouse was certainly in Surrey, I should have thought it risky to infer more than that the quarrel itself took place in its neighbourhood. At the same time we have, as Mr Hotson points out, a tantalising reference by Malone to a lost paper from which 'our poet appears to have lived in Southwark, near the Bear-Garden, in 1596,' while the conjecture is at least consistent with the complicated evidence of the subsidy rolls.

One would hardly imagine Southwark to have been a very convenient

residence for Shakespeare if his company was acting, as is generally assumed, at the Theatre in Shoreditch. This consideration and his association with Langley have led Mr Hotson to the conclusion that in the autumn of 1596 Shakespeare's company was located, not at the Theatre, but at the Swan. Although this conjecture cannot be disproved it nevertheless seems very improbable. The company had been at the Theatre not long before, since Lodge, writing early in 1596, spoke of *Hamlet* as acted there: and it was probably at the same house a few months later, since Pembroke's men opened at the Swan in February 1597. If Shakespeare moved from Bishopsgate, where he was assessed in October 1596, to Southwark in order to follow his company in a brief transpontine adventure, he clearly made a false move unlikely in so shrewd a man. I would suggest that his migration, if indeed it took place that autumn, may rather have been occasioned by Burbage's frustrated intention to open the Blackfriars house for the winter season, coupled perhaps with early plans in regard to the Globe, since difficulties were already rife over the ground lease of the Theatre. If these were Shakespeare's motives he showed no lack of foresight.

The most solid and most interesting part of Mr Hotson's book appears to me to be his full-length portrait of the rascally justice, William Gardiner. As here depicted his life stands out as a typical Elizabethan epic of successful villany, such as Jonson would have given us in *Volpone* had he resisted the temptation of a moral ending. It is true that this effect is achieved by accepting everything alleged by witnesses against the Surrey magnate, and dismissing everything that he has to say on his own behalf. One feels that a little more light and shade would have added to the verisimilitude of the picture; and while admitting that the justice was an unpleasant character, it is permissible to wonder whether a more detached scholarship would approve the adjectival exuberance of such phrases as 'perverse nature,' 'malicious stomach,' 'obnoxious behaviour,' 'detestable disposition,' 'nefarious practices,' 'unsavoury character,' 'bad odour of his name,' 'shameless and persistent lies and perjuries,' 'crafty old churl,' 'avaricious cheat, liar, and heartless toady.' Apparently it was thought necessary thus to decorate the portrait in order to account for Gardiner's wholly mythical quarrel with the gentle Shakespeare.

And this imaginary quarrel is the foundation stone of Mr Hotson's last and most daring edifice. Gardiner married as his first wife Frances, the widow of one Edmund Wayte, who turns out to have been the daughter of a Robert Lucy, and he thus acquired, and occasionally exercised, the right to impale the well-known Lucy arms of three lucas haurient argent. On the strength of this Mr Hotson would substitute William Gardiner for Sir Thomas Lucy as the hero of the lousy coat, and find his portrait in Justice Shallow. But in spite of many pages of special pleading he fails, to my mind, to make the suggestion in any way plausible. One may readily believe that the joke about white 'louses' was cracked at the expense of every Lucy who boasted a coat, and yet doubt whether it would have had any point against one of another name.

We have no reason even to suppose that Shakespeare, still less his audience, knew of Gardiner's occasional use of the Lucy arms, for in saying that the knowledge was 'common property in Shakespeare's time,' Mr Hotson once again goes beyond anything for which he has warrant. Nor is there the least resemblance between doddering Robert Shallow and the formidable and sinister William Gardiner, and I cannot sum up the case better than in Mr Hotson's own words: 'Falstaff makes old Shallow's proclivity for lying matter for mirth: but the old man's lies are the harmless prattle of a dotard. Justice Gardiner's notorious and repeated perjuries in courts of law, if soberly taken, were a subject less of laughter than of scandal.' It is all very well to argue that in drawing a satirical portrait it may be safer not to make it too lifelike, and that ridicule may be a deadlier weapon than abuse. But for the shaft of laughter to find its mark it must be aimed at characteristics familiar in the original, and for satire to be effective the portrait must be recognisable. If it is suggested that on the stage Shallow may have been got up to resemble Gardiner in order to give point to an otherwise unintelligible jest, one must admit the possibility. But we to-day have to argue the case on the evidence before us, and on this Gardiner is a less plausible candidate than would be any member of the Lucy clan.

Mr Hotson's hypothesis necessitates dating both 2 *Henry IV* and *The Merry Wives* between November 1596 and November 1597, and there is much that is attractive in his argument that the latter piece was written for the Garter feast in the spring of the latter year, when in fact 'cousin Garmumbles' was elected *in absentia*. That is a not impossible date for 2 *Henry IV*, and if *The Merry Wives* was also an Oldcastle play it must belong to the same period. But that would make it a deliberate insult to the Lord Chamberlain, such as could not possibly have been tolerated at Court, and there are other serious objections to so early a date, which may be studied in Sir E. K. Chambers's summary of the evidence.

The imposing collection of documents concerning Gardiner fills nearly a hundred and fifty pages. As *pièces justificatives* for Mr Hotson's account of that worthy they have, of course, their place in the volume. Still we might, with proper reference, have taken them on trust, and I can hardly suppose that for their own sake they will have any interest for students. Some are given in abstract only, others are transcribed *in extenso*, but even these have been modernised in spelling and punctuation 'for the convenience of the reader.' Surely no reader sufficiently interested and versed in Elizabethan legal records to wish to consult these texts at all would find the least difficulty in what to Mr Hotson is 'the gratuitous obstacle of a chaotic orthography,' while the lexical and philological value that exact reproductions would have possessed has been sacrificed. On their own lines the transcripts appear to be substantially correct, such errors as I have observed in checking a few samples being unimportant. At the same time damaged documents have not always been adequately deciphered nor the extent of the lacunae properly indicated, while some Latin headings and the like have

been translated without warning. In short the work is uncritical though probably not seriously misleading.

The book has been most attractively produced by the Nonesuch Press.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

Introductions to Jane Austen. By JOHN BAILEY. Oxford: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. viii + 147 pp. 6s.

This attractive little volume gives in convenient form the introductions written in 1927 for the Georgian edition of Jane Austen's novels, with the addition, for the sake of completeness, of studies of her life and letters and of *Love and Freindship* and *Sanditon*. It is a book which Janeites will want to read and to own: by 'sharing his enjoyment of the most enjoyable of authors' Mr Bailey does, as he hoped, increase the store which others already possess. In most of what he has to say—his remarks about Mrs Norris, for example ('There is no one in Jane Austen whom we so much enjoy disliking,' p. 63), his study of Darcy (pp. 44, 45), and more particularly his final summing up of the nature and quality of Jane Austen's art (pp. 141-7)—we feel that he has got at the heart of the matter. But it is much to be regretted that Mr Bailey should have revived and given the authority of his name to misconceptions which have been disproved more than once and which Miss Austen-Leigh hoped finally to clear away when she wrote her *Personal Aspects of Jane Austen*. We cannot tell how often Jane referred to public events in her letters to Cassandra (p. 13), for Cassandra destroyed most of the letters, keeping 'only those which she considered so totally devoid of general interest that it was impossible anyone should, at any time, contemplate their publication' (*Personal Aspects*, p. 48). Even if Jane was not 'learned,' it is certainly an exaggeration to speak of her as 'the exact opposite of a highly educated, obviously serious or intellectual woman' (p. 21): nor could anyone who had read many of the women novelists of her time think her boast to the Regent's Librarian justified by anything but her own modesty. Again, Jane's attitude to children is not 'invariably critical and condemnatory' (p. 102); even if the spoilt children in the novels make their presence felt more than the others, Jane makes it clear that the parents are to blame for the spoiling, and we have the little Gardiners and Charles Blake and many more to show how delightful she knew children could be and how well she understood them.

There are, too, points in Mr Bailey's interpretation of some of the characters against which many Janeites will protest: in one or two cases, indeed, he seems almost to convict himself of exaggeration—one wonders how he would have reconciled what he says of Jane's 'failure' in the portrayal of such important characters as the Crawfords (p. 62) or Jane Fairfax and Frank Churchill (p. 74) with what he says elsewhere of the 'perfection of her achievement.' It is interesting, indeed, to compare Mr Bailey's criticism of *Emma* with that of the late Professor

Arthur Platt. According to Mr Bailey, 'Emma dislikes her imaginary rivals before she is aware of her love,' while Knightley 'is aware of his love, but not at all aware of his jealousy' (p. 69). According to Professor Platt, Emma's love for Mr Knightley, so long as she is unconscious of it, acts as a talisman, enabling her to see rightly where he is in question, but in the great scene with Harriet the talisman is broken; Mr Knightley, on the other hand, aware of both his love and his jealousy, does *not* see rightly where Emma and Frank Churchill are concerned. This is surely the truer interpretation. Jane Austen herself explains that Mr Knightley 'had been in love with Emma, and jealous of Frank Churchill, from about the same period, one sentiment having probably enlightened him as to the other' (Oxford edition, p. 432); while Emma never dislikes Harriet, and has no fear of Jane Fairfax as a rival: she dislikes Jane for other reasons, but is quite sure that Mr Knightley's liking for her does not go beyond friendship, though she does watch him for half an hour, after Mrs Weston's emphatic declaration to the contrary, to confirm her own certainty. The excellence of the book as a whole makes one regret the more that it is no longer possible to join issue with Mr Bailey himself on such points.

H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

LONDON.

Psychologie de la Construction dans la Phrase française moderne. Par FÉLIX BOILLOT. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France. 1930. 307 pp. 50 fr.

In a line of verse or a sentence of prose genuinely deserving to rank as literature no word can be replaced, no word can be transposed without irreparable injury to the text. Thought and form are indissolubly combined; their intimate fusion constitutes style. These are truisms familiar to every student of literature, but which it is particularly necessary for the student of a foreign literature to bear constantly in mind. To learn a foreign language to good purpose is to acquire power of appreciating that uniqueness of expression which is the essence of great literature, and to realise the inherent inadequacy of translation even when executed by a master hand. M. Boillot's brilliant essay, *La Psychologie de la Construction dans la Phrase française moderne*, affords invaluable aid for the appreciation of the fine points of French style. His English experience has served him admirably: for it is patent that the arduous task of conveying to disciples of different language and mentality the full savour and values of the great authors of his own nation has led him to a minute and fruitful analysis of his personal literary impressions. The title chosen by M. Boillot for his work, accurately though it describes the contents, might, by its technicality, repel the general reader. If it did so, it would be unfortunate. Let him be reassured. Here he will find pages charmingly penned, and matters which he wrongly suspected jejune treated with that luminous clarity we are accustomed to associate with French scholarship at its best. Perhaps we should be most grateful to the author for the artistry with which he has selected his illustrations: individually they

could hardly be improved upon; collectively their lesson is imperative. How many a familiar line from Molière, La Fontaine and La Bruyère shines for us here with added lustre, its full force, its harmonious propriety or its ingenious finesse brought out to the full by M. Boillot's excellent commentary. Taken in the mass, the quotations fill us with amazement at the complexity of literary effect and with a sense of awe for the genius and craftsmanship of its inventors. The literary language is a perpetual and personal creation. It is an adaptation to æsthetic ends of an everyday utilitarian instrument; it exists in virtue of its contrast with commonplace, banal speech. By each writer it is moulded specifically; the connoisseur of style can as unerringly refer a page to its author as a connoisseur in vintages can identify a wine by its peculiar bouquet. How is it done? Reading M. Boillot's pages we feel that, some day, somehow it may be possible to embody each writer's idiosyncrasy in a scientific formula expressing his epoch and his individuality. It is a suggestion; we would not saddle him with the responsibility of having said as much in categorical terms. But, like all pioneer works, his abounds with suggestive remarks, which, for the time being, he has judged inopportune to develop. Rich as his book is in precise and convincing data in support of his assertions on points of literary technique, it is perhaps even more remarkable for the frequent passages stimulating to extensions of his thought. Such are the paragraphs in which he broaches the subject of those features of the everyday language, stress, intonation, and gesture, which the written word would appear impotent to fix, yet for which it, nevertheless, contrives renderings or substitutes; or those in which he shows that style is relative to a particular time-state of the language, and is thus continuously renewable and renewed. Incidentally, too, we are made to realise, how relative must be our appreciation of a bygone style. Highly suggestive also is M. Boillot's passing reflection upon the possible causes of the decline of French as a European *lingua franca*, a decline, he hints, due less to the decay of French political preponderance than to the modern tendency of the language towards fullness of expression, and the regrafting of the emotional and descriptive upon that severely logical idiom devised by the eighteenth century as an instrument of politico-social propaganda. Here we might differ from the author and incline to think that the influence of the new French literary instrument is equally profound and pervasive.

So much for ideas dropped by the way. Each chapter, in the matter exhaustively and methodically handled, abounds in surprises even for the well versed scholar. The means at the disposal of the writer for varying his phrase are, as M. Boillot demonstrates, limited and easily tabulated; the effects that can be achieved by those means, conditioned by context, are infinite. It is, however, impossible to summarise these admirable chapters; all in them depends upon the numerous and cogent examples with which each affirmation is backed. All form an elaborate commentary upon the power of 'un mot mis à sa place.' The student will test for himself every illustration and judge the ruinous effect of any perturbation of the construction so cunningly fashioned by its author.

Most novel will appear to him, perhaps, the chapter in which it is shown how the phrase form reinforcing or duplicating the sense conveyed by the actual words is able to evoke the almost physical feeling of shape, space, duration and movement.

If there is any section of the book at which we might be disposed to cavil, it is that dealing with rhythmical and metrical forms. Here the treatment is strictly conservative. M. Boillot, who claims to approach his subject scientifically, must be well aware that the measurement of rhythm must be a measurement in precise units of time; the solution of rhythmical problems belongs to the laboratory; there alone will the elaborate designs of rhythmical composition be demonstrated, and, when the time comes, it may well prove that the wonderful invention called metre, when realised in perfect recitation, entails the reproduction of the poet's personal intonation and expression.

It would, however, be ungenerous to terminate this short notice in a tone of disparagement. This is a book entirely to be recommended to the serious student of French. It is quite impossible that he should close it without having derived both great delight and profit. M. Boillot has already won himself a name for erudition combined with taste of a high order.

The volume is provided with a useful bibliography and a serviceable index.

J. W. JEAFFRESON.

LONDON.

Sur la Légende de Napoléon. Par JULES DECHAMPS. (*Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée*, LXXIII.) Paris: H. Champion. 1931. ix + 276 pp. 40 fr.

The present reviewer recalls a day in his childhood when, in the Wiertz Museum at Brussels, he was permitted to look through a peep-hole and contemplate a picture of Napoleon in Hell. This was his first introduction to the 'legend of Napoleon,' which the author of the singularly interesting and well-documented volume before us defines provisionally as 'l'ensemble des effets d'ordre sentimental ou esthétique produits par l'histoire de Napoléon et de son temps' (p. 30).

Professor Dechamps observes that the development of the legend is an international phenomenon. He examines its effects on French romanticism, 'l'obsession napoléonienne dans la littérature de 1830,' its revival in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Is the legend 'populaire' or 'savante'? Quinet, Gustave Planche, and Sainte-Beuve associated the figure of Napoleon with the hero of the mediæval epic; Professor Dechamps, very suggestively, points out how the development of the legend confirms, or at least illustrates, the older theory of the formation of the 'légendes épiques du moyen âge,' according to which the traditional element—'récits, lais, contes populaires'—has played its part (pp. 55-61):

La légende de Napoléon est une synthèse aussi, une synergie de tendances, une 'vérité' plus portative que celle de la vie vécue dans sa complexité, avec ses périodes de clair-obscur, ses inévitables contradictions, ses faiblesses et ses fautes.

Sa beauté consiste en ce que, répondant à des aspirations pratiques, elle a un caractère positif et qu'en même temps, elle est devenue un très naturel, un impérissable thème poétique. Le fait qu'elle a été utilisée pour des fins politiques ne saurait prévaloir toutefois contre l'autre fait, beaucoup plus considérable. Si on la définit provisoirement comme l'ensemble des effets d'ordre sentimental et esthétique produits par l'histoire de Napoléon, on doit avouer qu'elle est au-dessus des doctrines, des partis et des nationalités (p. 61).

Subsequent chapters deal at length with the universal popularity of the legend, its appearance in folk-law and imagery (III), its international development as shown in literature and art (IV), its genuine historical basis (V, 'Histoire et légende'), its position in the history and culture of Belgium from the fall of the Empire to the revolution of 1830 (VI, 'La légende en formation'). The last chapter, as we should expect, is full of interesting and curious details. There is a valuable bibliography unassumingly described as 'un premier essai.' The whole book is written with an enthusiasm that is infectious.

It would be ungenerous, after Professor Dechamps' modest preface, to criticise his omissions; but there are two countries, of great significance in the story, that seem somewhat inadequately treated: Poland and Italy. While due place is given to the Napoleonic enthusiasm of Mickiewicz, there is no mention of Krasinski, with his magnificent apotheosis of Napoleon in the prose introduction to *Dawn* and in the *Unfinished Poem*. It is noteworthy that, like Conrad, Sienkiewicz died in the act of writing a Napoleonic romance. As to Italy:

L' anima altera
Che nel gran cor di Bonaparte brilla,
Fu dell' italo sole una scintilla.

It is surprising to find no mention of Vincenzo Monti, surely the chief creator of the Napoleon legend in Italy in the literary field—the Italian who filled the void left by the 'sécheresse d'âme' (p. 108) which Professor Dechamps recognises in the French poets of the period. And, among the painters of the Napoleonic epic, an honoured place should surely have been given to Monti's contemporary, Andrea Appiani (p. 120). As examples of the way in which, after the restoration of 1814, Italian poets were compelled to represent the Napoleonic cycle by means of events and personages borrowed from other times, we are told that 'Pindemonte et Foscolo figurent Bonaparte, le premier sous les traits d'Arminius, l'autre sous les traits d'Ajax dans leurs tragédies' (p. 115). Here is some strange confusion of chronology at least. The *Arminio* of Ippolito Pindemonte (of which the prologue is dated 1797) was published in 1804, the *Atace* of Ugo Foscolo was produced at Milan in 1811. The subsequent performance of Foscolo's drama was prohibited by the government of Eugène Beauharnais on the suspicion that Ajax was intended to represent, not Napoleon, but Moreau—the Emperor himself being represented by Agamemnon. We miss, too, the name of Mazzini, whose essay of 1832, *Ai poeti del secolo XIX*, is one of the most notable Italian contributions to the Napoleonic legend, and inspired Carducci's noble ode: *Per la morte di Napoleone Eugenio*. But, as Professor Dechamps well says in his preface: 'Nous voudrions qu'on pût dérouler l'histoire poétique tout

entière de Napoléon jusqu'à nos jours, comme on l'a fait, par exemple, pour tel héros médiéval. Nous songeons à un livre comme celui de M. Golther sur *Tristan*' (p. ix). In such an 'histoire poétique' the tribute of Italy to one of the greatest of her sons would be worthy of the country of Dante.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Italian Influence on the Poets of the Ragusan Republic. By JOSIP TORBARINA. London: Williams and Norgate. 1931. 243 pp. 12s. 6d.

An almost unknown field for English readers is opened by Dr Josip Torbarina in the volume before us. The Italian influence upon the Serbo-Croat school of poetry, which flourished in Dubrovnik from the end of the fifteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth century, produced a literature which was 'the issue of a marriage between the Slavonic element and Mediterranean culture' (p. 15). In the first part of the book, we are given a vivid and attractive picture of the cultural relations between Italy and the little republic, 'specchio d' Illiria e suo pregio maggiore,' during the period under review, a story in which a prominent place is held by the great archbishop whom Titian painted, Lodovico Beccadelli, who lived in his see for five years during which he was the centre of the intellectual life of Dubrovnik. Here Dr Torbarina has made excellent use of the unpublished correspondence of Beccadelli in the Biblioteca Palatina of Parma, already drawn upon by him in two previous publications. Particularly interesting are the relations between the three brothers of the Nalješković family and Antonio Brucioli, the connexions between the Ragusans and the Aldine Press, and the activities of one of the last Italian rectors of the school of Dubrovnik, Francesco Serdonati, who introduced allusions to the history of the Yugoslavs in his sequel to the *De casibus virorum illustrium* of Boccaccio.

The second part, 'l'apologie de l'influence,' examines in detail the Italian element in the work of the individual Ragusan poets from Šiško Menčetić and Gjore Držić to Dominko Ranjina and Dominko Zlatarić. Dr Torbarina observes that Menčetić and Držić hold a position in Yugoslav literature corresponding to that of Wyatt and Surrey in English, but the Ragusan *canzoniere*, in which their poems are preserved, was compiled exactly half a century earlier than Tottel's *Miscellany* (p. 137). While Petrarch is naturally the chief 'maestro e autore,' he seems to have been anticipated by Serafino dell' Aquila, and it is curious to notice the influence, besides that of Lorenzo de' Medici and Poliziano, of such a forgotten minor poet as Antonio Ricco (p. 98). Both Menčetić and Držić show some slight knowledge of the *Divina Commedia*. With later poets comes the influence of Bembo, Giovanni della Casa, Angelo di Costanzo, Tansillo and others, and curiously again, in the case of Ranjina, that of the insignificant Bartolomeo Cavassico (pp. 147-9). As to Dominko Ranjina, Dr Torbarina conclusively destroys the legend of his 'classicism,' that he was 'the coryphaeus of a new literary school' with whom 'the classical influence gets the upper hand,' showing that his supposed

paraphrases from Latin and Greek classics are in reality derived from Luigi Alamanni and Bernardo Tasso (pp. 166–85). Dominko Zlatarić, a more original and finer poet, with a certain resemblance to Ariosto in temperament, introduced blank verse into Ragusan poetry with his translation of the younger Tasso's *Aminta*.

Though primarily intended as a contribution to Slavonic studies, Dr Torbarina's work is no less valuable for the student of the literature of the Italian Renaissance.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Allgemeine Bücherkunde zur neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Von ROBERT F. ARNOLD. 3te Auflage. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1931. xxiv + 362 pp. 14.50 M.

The best tribute to the abiding value of Professor Arnold's *Allgemeine Bücherkunde* is that it has now appeared in a third edition. Originally published in 1910, the second enlarged edition of 1919 was soon exhausted, and it has for several years been unobtainable; thus the new edition is overdue. In a literature whose bibliographies fill us on this side of the channel with admiration and envy, Professor Arnold's work occupies a niche by itself; it has every right to describe itself as indispensable to students and especially libraries. Its scope is both larger and smaller than might be inferred from the title. Larger, because its contents embrace general histories of 'world literatures,' and of each literature in respect of its points of contact with that of Germany; smaller, in so far as it takes no account of individual authors—where, of course, it would merely go over ground covered so admirably by Goedeke's *Grundriss*. There are, however, sections dealing with the bibliography of individual groups—lyric, 'Novelle,' drama—as well as of fields outside literature proper, such as religion, philosophy, science and the arts. By a rigid system of abbreviation, which makes the book rather uneasy reading, an astounding amount of bibliographical information is crammed into its pages, and that information is surprisingly up-to-date, even in respect of works published outside Germany. The self-sacrificing labour that has gone to its compilation must have been enormous. We are under a great debt to Professor Arnold, and he is to be congratulated on the completion of a task which, although subsequent editions may add to its titles, can hardly improve upon its scope, arrangement and general plan.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

Men, Myths and Movements in German Literature. By WILLIAM ROSE. London: G. Allen and Unwin. 1931. 286 pp. 10s. 6d.

Dr William Rose's volume of studies covers a wide range of German literature, although not perhaps wide enough to justify the inclusion of the word 'myths' in his title. Neither the *Faust* saga nor the Beast

Epic can fairly be described as a myth. These studies have appeared in print before with the exception of two: *Goethe and the Jews* and *The Spirit of Revolt in German Literature*. The first is a solid and valuable contribution written without that 'ira' and 'studium' so unpleasantly conspicuous in German contributions to the theme: Dr Rose amasses his material carefully and critically and his conclusions are convincing. Of the other items, those on the Beast Epic, on Baron Münchhausen, on *Faust* and on *Werther*, betray the fact that they were originally written as introductions to the texts which they discuss. Dr Rose seems to lead up to his theme with an elaborate overture, but then leaves us; the curtain does not rise.

The early history of the Beast Epic is too full of interrogation points to allow of a very lucid presentation; but Dr Rose has done his best with it; I miss, however, a more decisive attitude to the conflicting views. The discussion of the *Historical Faust* and the *Faust Book*—the longest and most elaborate of these essays is particularly good; the best tribute to it is that we feel disappointed when we do not pass on to the book itself. Dr Rose clearly sees that 'the Promethean defiance which some scholars have sought to establish as his guiding motive, was a preconception implanted in their own minds by a study of the *Faust* of Goethe,' and he might have given more substance to this just criticism by elaborating his own estimate of the *Faustbuch*. On p. 76 he speaks of the puppet play of *Dr Faust* surviving 'till well into the nineteenth century': but does it not still survive? I remember seeing it presented more than once by travelling puppet-players in my own student days. In reviewing Goethe's *Faust* on the English stage, mention should surely have been made of Henry Irving's production which did more than anything else to familiarise the British public with Goethe's drama. The account of *The Historical Background of Goethe's Werther*, which formed the introduction to Dr Rose's own translation of the novel published last year, is excellent, but one misses again criticism of the data. Least satisfactory is the introduction to Grimmelshausen's *Simplicissimus*, where the important work—published since the essay was originally written—by G. Könneke (1926–28) has made considerable modification necessary of the information given here. The sympathetic essay on Novalis leads one to hope that Dr Rose will soon give us his promised volume on that writer. Lastly, the reader who is confused by the journalistic and uncritical eulogy of so many contemporary German books on the literature of the present day, may be recommended to study carefully Dr Rose's survey of that literature. It is a pity, however, that he did not recast his three chapters and group their contents better: there is considerable overlapping and repetition, especially between the two first.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

Johan ūz dem virgiere. Eine spätmittelhochdeutsche Ritterdichtung nach flämischer Quelle nebst dem Faksimileabdruck des flämischen Volksbuches *Joncker Jan wt den vergiere*. Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von ROBERT PRIEBSCHE. (*Germanische Bibliothek: Untersuchungen und Texte*, xxxii.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1931. 144 pp. + 28 leaves (facsimile of chapbook). 10 M.

A new Middle High German epic does not come to light every day, and the publication of this book has been awaited with much interest. Professor Priebisch discovered the MS. of *Johan ūz dem virgiere* at Cheltenham where it belonged to the Bibliotheca Philippica as No. 8316. A careful description of the MS. and an outline of its contents appeared in Professor Priebisch's *Deutsche Handschriften in England*, I, Erlangen, 1896, pp. 38 and 241-83. In 1912, the MS. was purchased by Sir Max Waechter, presented to the ex-Kaiser, and deposited in the Royal Library at Berlin, now the Staatsbibliothek (Germ. Qu. 1476).

Johan is an illegitimate child of noble birth, his mother sister to the king of France, his father count of Artois. The father places the child, together with valuable gifts (including a horse!) in the 'treegarden' (*virgiere*) of the emperor Sigismund. The emperor finds the child and it is brought up together with his daughter in ignorance of its origin. The boy grows up a model of knightly virtues, and he is fiercely hated by a court party headed by the traitor Gaveron. In a moment of displeasure the empress calls Johan a foundling, the truth can no longer be withheld, the foundling goes out into the world to discover his father, *werz kruppel oder blint man*. After many other adventures, Johan vanquishes a knight who proves to be his father. At the intercession of Johan, the French king permits the marriage of his sister to the count of Artois, Johan becomes king of France, marries the emperor's daughter and is crowned emperor.

Three main themes are embodied in this epic: a foundling's search for his parents, love of a foundling for the daughter of an emperor (king), a foundling becomes emperor (king). There were many similar stories current during the Middle Ages and Professor Priebisch writes a fascinating chapter (pp. 1-29) in which he deals with both sources and influence of the original tale. In this he is helped by the Flemish chapbook *Joncker Jan wt den vergiere* of which an excellently reproduced photographic facsimile is given. The chapbook appeared round about 1590—only one copy is known to exist, that of the University Library of Göttingen—the Middle High German poem belongs to the middle of the fourteenth century. By careful comparison, the editor establishes the contents of the lost Middle Dutch Epic (**Jan*) on which both the Flemish chapbook and the Middle High German epic largely depend (cp. *Johan*, 25 ff.: *Und diz buch werde vollenbraht, Daz ich zu schriben habe gedaht Uz flemschen in unser dutsche sleht* and the rhyme *swerte : sperte* (ë : a) taken over from the Dutch *swaerde : spaerde*). **Jan* must have been written c. 1300. It is to a large extent dependent on the lost Old French *Richars li Biaus* which has been reconstructed from the younger *Richars li Biaus* and the Middle Dutch *Riddere metter mouwen*. Professor Priebisch adduces

weighty arguments which seem to prove that the author of the *Riddere metter Mouwen* was also acquainted with the lost *lai d'Esgare*, the source of the Middle English *Sire Degarre*. On account of *Riddere metter Mouwen* 1773: *Dat was te Doerve in Ingelant* the *lai d'Esgare* was probably localised in England and not in *Bretaigne*, as is assumed by the latest editor of *Sire Degarre*¹. **Jan* shows some striking correspondences to *Sire Degarre*: the letter around the neck of the foundling (*Johan*, 126-30; *Sire Degarre*, 200-210), the locality of the fight between father and son (*Johan*, 2451 ff.; *Sire Degarre*, 991 ff.); in *Sire Degarre* father and son recognise one another by a sword (1047 ff.), in *Johan* (2546 ff.) by a ring. Since the ring is not mentioned as one of the gifts left with the deserted child (*Johan*, 83 ff.) it is probably introduced *ad hoc*, possibly from the tradition found in the *lai de Doon*, *lai de Milun*, and *Yder*. Thus the *lai d'Esgare* has to be considered a subsidiary source of **Jan*. A comparison of **Jan* with other Dutch poems, notably with *Renout van Montalbaen*, does not lead to any certain results, nor are the many similarities between **Jan* and the *Riddere metter Mouwen* conclusive proof of influence though it remains likely enough that the author of **Jan* knew and utilised the *Riddere metter Mouwen*. Possibly both poems are by the same author, in which case **Jan* would have to be regarded a later work. Of French sources apart from *Richars li Biaus* and the *lai d'Esgare* the only important one is the *Geste de Saint-Gille* which supplies the figure of the traitor Gaveron (ultimate prototype: Ganelon). However, **Jan* is here probably indebted to Dutch poems that have made use of the *geste*, *Renout van Montalbaen* and *Ogier*.

There remains the influence which **Jan* had on later works. Apart from giving rise to the Middle High German *Johan* and the Flemish chapbook, it is one of the principal sources of the *abel spel van Esmoreit*² and the chapbook *Joncker Jan* may have supplied some details for the French chapbook which lies behind the *Volksbuch von dem gehörnten Siegfried*. The author of **Jan* wished to write a biographical epic on the lines of *Richars li Biaus* but he did not follow his main source slavishly. His wide acquaintance with Old French and Middle Dutch heroic story supplied many a detail. Of original invention there is little; he was content to take his matter where he could find it. Yet he has set his stamp on the poem. *Jan* is the ideal representative of knighthood: courageous, God-fearing and faithful. The author despises the fairy-tale trappings of Arthurian and late mediæval romance. His hero is rather a straightforward, unproblematic knight whose adventures, though exaggerated, take place in a real world amongst real people.

His Middle High German translator, a gleeman writing in the dialect of southern Rhine-Hesse, has not altered the background of reality. On the whole, he is a competent versifier who compares favourably with the early fifteenth-century translators of Dutch poems (*Reinolt*, *Malagis*, etc.). His additions to the story clearly reflect his own interests and those

¹ G. Schleich, *Sire Degarre*, *Englische Textbibliothek*, xix, Heidelberg, 1929, pp. 21, 24.

² For a detailed discussion of this influence cp. R. Priebisch, *Ein Beitrag zu den Quellen des Esmoreit*, *Neophilologus*, vii, 1922, pp. 57-62.

of his public: Gaveron and Johan quarrelling in front of the emperor (2372 ff.), the gibe at the loquacity of women (411 ff.), the scene between emperor and empress (398: *Die frauwen er in den munt slug*). On the other hand court etiquette is overemphasised. When the emperor's daughter is half starved and Johan offers her some bread: *vil edeliche beiz sie dran* (2162). Emperor and empress are never without their crown, Johan's mother addresses him as *her ritter* even at the moment when she has recognised her long-lost son. The book ends with a description of the wedding of Johan and the emperor's daughter, and the poet pretends that he was present: *Fursten und herren zusamene quamen Und manig grave, ritter und kneht: Die sprachen, diz buch iver geschriben reht*.

The scribe hails from the same locality, but he is writing a hundred years later. This does not make the task of reconstruction any easier. Professor Priebsch gives an admirable text which errs, if at all, on the conservative side. The vocabulary shows a decided preference for 'unhöfische Wörter': *stolz, bald, gedagen*, etc. Of rare words we may note: *meigengang* (*Maengang*, not in *Lexen*), *kussmulen* (*Kussmälchen*, not in *Lexen*, only modern references in *Grimm*), *kaspe* = *kapse* (earliest occurrence known), *gauweknabe* (illegitimate child, not in *Lexen* or *Grimm*).

Together with parts of *Karlmeinet*, the fragment of a Norman Duke *Heinrich*, perhaps also the *Herzog von Braunschweig*, *Johan ûz dem virgiere* belongs to a group of poems that were adapted from Middle Dutch sources during the fourteenth century. Apart from its intrinsic merits, *Johan ûz dem virgiere* is thus of some importance in the literary history of the fourteenth century, and is an excellent example of the intelligent and unhampered manner in which a literary craftsman of the time dealt with a foreign source. The comparative independence of the Middle High German author is a welcome relief from the uninspired line-by-line method which characterises the fifteenth-century translations *Reinolt* and *Malagis*.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

Egil's Saga. Done into English by E. R. EDDISON. Cambridge: University Press. 1930. xxxvi + 346 pages. 2 maps. 18s.

If judgment were to be based only on Mr Eddison's love of his original and of its brethren, manifest in his Preface, Introduction and Terminal Essay, not to speak of the affectionate care with which he has provided notes, maps and index for the better understanding of the story, there could be nothing but commendation for his version of *Egil's Saga*. It is the version itself, the actual translation, which awakens uneasiness. One may agree, as this reviewer agrees, with nearly every word in the terminal essay on some principles of translation, and yet feel that the translator sometimes flouts his own principles and sometimes carries them too far, that he occasionally falls into 'pet pedantries,' opposite to those which he rightly condemns in some earlier translators from the Icelandic but equally pedantic. English and Icelandic are, as he says,

'akin in word, syntax, and idiom.' But they are akin, and not, as he sometimes makes them, identical. There is a case to be made out for literal translation of vivid word or idiom which explains itself or is explained by the context—such a word, for example, as 'shapestrong' or 'skinchanger.' There seems to be none for representing what is normal in Icelandic by what is abnormal in English. 'Fared they back then by daylight to his folk' (p. 97) is a literal translation of a sentence in one of the normal forms of Icelandic prose, but this kind of inversion is not normal in English prose. Yet sentences of this construction occur again and again, until an intelligent reader, ignorant of the original, naturally supposes that Icelandic prose is as artificial as skaldic verse. Too close an approximation to the word-order of Icelandic, too great anxiety to avoid flatness or Latinism, sometimes defeat Mr Eddison's own end, to give the lover of a good story something of the thrill which is felt by those who are able to read the sagas themselves. This is not a theoretical objection: it is based on experiment. When such a reader complains that enjoyment of the story is checked by difficulty in understanding the turns of phrase, and asks specifically what is meant by 'Now Thorolf gat him under the hand of the King and went there into the lay of the bodyguard' (p. 12), what honest answer can be given? Only that 'gat him under the hand of the King' is an expression which no one could fairly be expected to understand, since it is neither idiomatic English nor a translation of the Icelandic idiom, *gerðist handgenginn konungi*, and that 'lay' is equally un-English, being a transliteration rather than a translation of the second element in *hirðlög*. Not only here but elsewhere Mr Eddison seems not to be following the first and greatest in this kind of the two masters whom he acknowledges, Dasent and Morris, scarcely even the second, but far more to be rivalling Dan Michel of Northgate. No meaner practitioner than Dan Michel is followed in such a sentence, not exceptional, as this: 'That was in the earlier days of Earl Hakon the Great, then was Egil Skallagrimson in the ninth ten-years of his age, and he was then a brisk man for all other sakes save loss of eyesight' (p. 220). Norse English is no better English than the Latinised English which most of us dislike as heartily as Mr Eddison does. It is not fair of him to offer us a rendering which so often requires reference to the original to make it intelligible. Those whom he had most in mind during his labours cannot refer to the original and, regrettable though this may be, find Norse English more difficult to understand than Latin English. One reviewer at least has not recovered from the disappointing results of trying to make the use which Mr Eddison intended of his translation, as a bait to the ignorant. He might retort that the use of Laing's *Heimskringla* might have had even more disappointing results. Yet, when all is said, Laing has called many to the sagas, and, with exactly the opposite faults, Mr Eddison may call others of the pre-destinate.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

Le Théâtre de Strindberg. A. JOLIVET. (*Bibliothèque de la Revue des Cours et Conférences.*) Paris: Boivin. 1931. 356 pp. 20 fr.

'Strindberg literature' is still largely a literature round the personality of the Swedish writer; outside Sweden, the literary historian has shown reluctance to grapple with the purely poetic aspects of his work. This is partially due to the fact that so much material in the shape of important correspondence still awaits publication: the critic is wary of dogmatising until all the facts are before him for the judgment of a writer whose fifty-five volumes are, in Goethe's phrase, 'fragments of a great confession'; as Professor Jolivet in this volume says: 'toute l'œuvre n'est qu'une biographie continue.' We thus welcome the present volume. Building on the first important contribution to a critical estimate of Strindberg's dramatic work, Professor Lamm's *Strindbergs Dramer* (Stockholm, 1924-26)¹, it gives an excellent survey of this side of his activity.

Professor Jolivet has not, moreover, limited his study to printed sources: he has had access in Stockholm to much material that is still unprinted; he has thus undertaken his task with full seriousness, and not merely as a 'vulgarisateur' of what is already familiar to the specialist. As was to be expected, he has much that is suggestive to say of Strindberg's ties with French thought and literature. He sums up admirably and succinctly the problems of *Mäster Olof* and the other dramas of Strindberg's early period, seen in the mirror of his chequered and 'complex'-ridden life. The book is, however, lacking in proportion: it tails off seriously as it proceeds. The period anterior to 'les drames naturalistes' is dealt with in about a third of the volume; the naturalistic phase in another third; and only a third remains for the large dramatic output of the period from the *Inferno* crisis onwards. In particular, it is to be regretted that the long series of historical dramas of Strindberg's Indian summer is most summarily disposed of in a dozen pages, which seem ill to justify the concluding words of the chapter: 'Ce sont les drames écrits en 1899 qui, avec *Mäster Olof* (to which Professor Jolivet devoted nearly forty pages) font de lui un des maîtres du drame historique.' Clearly the day has not yet come for a full justification of the phrase 'maître du drame historique.' In a brief preface to the last volume of the publications of the Anglo-Swedish Literary Foundation I have indicated the lines on which, it seems to me, an approach to this aspect of Strindberg's theatre might be profitably pursued. Professor Jolivet, too, emphasises, as has also been done in a recent American academic publication reviewed in these pages², the significance of the mystic side of Strindberg's work for the German 'Expressionist' movement: but as far as I see, he, no more than his American predecessor, has come to grips with the real facts and problems of that alleged influence. For this, too, the time has perhaps not yet come.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

¹ See *Modern Language Review*, XXII, pp. 354 ff.

² See above, pp. 111 f.

SHORT NOTICES

The *Bulletin* of the Western Reserve University has a respectable record of many years of activity, with an annual output of twenty numbers. The number before us (New Series. Vol. xxxiv, No. 13. Cleveland, Ohio. 1931. 89 pp.) contains *Studies in English Literature* of considerable interest. Professor A. F. White has studied the records of the office of the Revels in the Restoration period and brings together a quantity of information from the Lord Chamberlain's Books and elsewhere, with an excursus upon the dealings of the censorship with individual plays. Professor Winfield Rogers quotes satirical portraits of contemporary poets from obscure fiction of 1817-18, in which Byron, for example, figures as Lord Leander and Coleridge as Mr Crazy. It is odd that Mr Rogers does not mention the parallel with Peacock, whose *Melincourt* and *Nightmare Abbey* date precisely from 1817 and 1818. Mr George M. Rutter deals in a brief paper with the literary tradition behind the Wife of Bath, and Miss Sara Watson gives a full account of the Queen's Champion, Sir Henry Lee. In this paper Lee's mother appears on p. 68 to be the daughter of Sir Henry Wyatt and on p. 88 of Sir Thomas Wyatt. The transcript of a letter of Lee from MS. Harl. 286 has been somewhat perfunctorily done (pp. 72-3). There are very numerous inaccuracies. The words omitted are readily legible, e.g., for [] *yet*, read *ment yt*, and for [] *him in path up* read *Juyne him in patient*. The folio reference is wrongly given: for ff. 106, 107 read ff. 100, 101. Elsewhere other slips and misprints have escaped correction, e.g., *Alfred Feuillerat* for *Albert* (p. 5), *Oliver and Tyrant* for *Oliuer the Tyrant* (p. 10), *crops forth* for *crops up* (p. 46), *seige* for *siege* (p. 68). Nevertheless, this issue of the *Bulletin* bears witness to the scholarly ideals of the contributors to the series and of its General Editor, Professor White.

C. J. S.

Elizabethan patriotism is a commonplace of literary histories, and the patriotic impulse in the Elizabethan drama in particular has been an ever-recurring topic. Mr Richard Vliet Lindabury's *Study of Patriotism in the Elizabethan Drama* (*Princeton Studies in English*, v. Princeton: University Press; London: H. Milford. x + 218 pp. 9s.), however, is the first detailed and fully documented monograph on the subject. He has limited himself to the popular patriotism of the theatres because a more comprehensive survey 'of all forms of Elizabethan literature and all primary sources of Elizabethan history' would have involved him in too formidable a task. He might have maintained very reasonably that the nationalism of the Elizabethans, their self-confidence, and their sense of their happy isolation, essentially a popular sentiment, received its fullest and most varied expression in the popular drama. Such a subject as Mr Lindabury's presents obvious difficulties in handling, not the least of them being the devising of a scheme round which to group

the material. Under the first of his four major divisions, 'The Nation,' he considers the pride of the dramatists in their own country as it reveals itself in their glorification of England and of the English character, the education, customs, and traditions which shaped that character, and the martial and manly temper which was its guarantee. The more aggressive patriotism of the Elizabethans, 'The Challenge' to the rest of Europe, provides matter for the second and longest section of the book on the attitude, friendly, suspicious, or openly hostile, to foreign nations, especially to the bugbear Spain; on the criticism of the manners and morals of all the nationalities and races with which the Elizabethans had any dealings; on the opposition to the peaceful penetration of England by foreign settlers and visitors, and still more to the adoption of foreign modes of dress, speech, or thought by travelled and denationalised Englishmen; and on the prejudices against Popery which threatened the state and Puritanism which threatened the Englishman's pleasures, including the theatre. 'The Defence' illustrates the Elizabethan reliance on and sympathy with the two defenders of the English sanctuary, the soldier and the sailor. Lastly, in 'Subject and Sovereign,' Mr Lindabury sketches the national conception of kingship and of the subject's duty, and the extraordinary devotion to the Queen herself. Mr Lindabury attempts to give no more than a full and impartial record of the patriotic elements in the drama, not, save in the briefest way, to appraise them.

A. M. C.

In *Leading Motives in the Imagery of Shakespeare's Tragedies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1930. 46 pp. 2s.) Professor Caroline Spurgeon has brought us appreciably more closely in touch with the very contents and processes of Shakespeare's mind. Behind her study of Shakespeare's imagery, of which this lecture before the Shakespeare Association is the first-fruits, lie a patient and exhaustive indexing and analysis of every image in the Canon, upon which she has worked with her gift of creative perception. We may not all be prepared to follow Professor Spurgeon in her singling out of specific classes of imagery as especially dominant, in one or other of the instances she chooses. But she makes out admirable and striking cases, above all perhaps in *Hamlet*, with its *motif* of disease. The importance of her thesis is evident in the conclusion she draws here. Shakespeare sees the problem of *Hamlet* pictorially, '*not as the problem of an individual at all, but as... a condition for which the individual himself is apparently not responsible*' (p. 13). A similarly significant conclusion is her deduction of Shakespeare's view of Macbeth as 'a small, ignoble man encumbered and degraded by garments unsuited to him' (p. 20). But here, perhaps, she does not allow fully for the dramatic representation of his opponents' conception of him. The image, by the way, is one that might well haunt an actor-dramatist long used to stage-ings whom he knew only too well in their less imposing private capacity.

C. J. S.

Dr William Lee Sandidge's edition of *The Roman Actor* (Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1929. 161 pp. 9s.) is a useful contribution to the study of Massinger. The point is well made that the play has a direct bearing upon contemporary criticism of the stage by Puritan opponents, in especial upon the petition to Parliament by an anonymous writer, printed in 1625, to which the speech of Paris in defence of the actor's quality is an answer. Certain questions of interest are not discussed in the useful Introduction. Dr Sandidge might have considered, in his account of the sources of the play, whether Massinger's use of Suetonius pointed to the original or to Philemon Holland's translation. The copy for the quarto of 1629, again, deserves consideration. Was it not Massinger's autograph manuscript prepared for the stage? The stage-direction *Caesar goes on* (II, i, 223) is symptomatic. Have we not here, in fact, a prompt-copy with many similarities to the MS. *Beleue as you List*? And a complete collation of the MS. corrections in the Princeton copy of the 1629 quarto would have been welcome. Apparently they are in a contemporary hand, even if it cannot be definitely identified with Massinger's. The awkward and ugly device of enclosing variations in square brackets in the text could have been avoided by the use of footnotes. And the text is made more difficult to refer to by the absence of act and scene indications in the headlines. *Calendar* is misprinted *Callendar* on pages 124 and 125. C. J. S.

In *Dramatic Theory and the Rhymed Heroic Play* (London: H. Milford. 1931. viii + 235 pp. 10s. 6d.) Dr Cecil V. Deane has set out 'to determine how far the heroic play observed the neo-classic "Rules" of the drama as expounded by the French theorists and as somewhat freely adapted by English critics.' As he remarks, the age was genuinely interested in dramatic reform, and the rhymed heroic play is peculiarly the offspring of incoming neo-classicism and the independent temper of the national drama. Thanks to this latter element, certain aspects of neo-classic theory, the discussion of which by critics on both sides of the channel Dr Deane faithfully reports, are without practical significance for the heroic plays themselves. Nevertheless, all who are interested in Restoration dramatic criticism for its own sake will welcome this fully documented comparative survey, in which, naturally, Corneille and Dryden loom large. A dramatist discussing the theory of his art is always interesting. Dryden is particularly so, because with him theory and practice are never completely harmonised. Indeed, how could they be, when, in his hands, the heroic play changed shape more rapidly than he could decently vary his modified neo-classic theory to suit his practice?

Dr Deane's introductory consideration of the various forces which influenced the evolution of the heroic play and his concluding 'Analysis of Selected Plays,' wherein the influence of theory on practice is estimated, are the most interesting chapters of a useful book. Dr Deane's subject merited full investigation, and we are indebted to him for having undertaken the labour.

F. E. B.

• Miss M. Clive Hildyard's selections of *Lockhart's Literary Criticism* (Oxford: B. Blackwell. 1931. viii + 168 pp. 6s.) will give anyone who wishes for an introduction to early nineteenth-century reviewing a clear conception of the way in which it was carried on, and a chance to judge fairly one of the most acute, most generous and most unfair of the reviewers. For Lockhart's unfairness there is nearly always some excuse—a revolt against what seemed to him, and often was, false sentiment, or an ingenuous conviction that a man who took the wrong side in politics must have a good deal wrong in his personal or literary character. It is certain, too, that Lockhart's reputation has suffered from confusion between his work and Wilson's, probably also Maginn's. The width and generosity of his enjoyment atone for his undoubted and notorious lapses, and Miss Hildyard's selection from his casual and formal criticisms, together with her discriminating introductory essay, should help readers of this book to make a just appraisal of the man and his work. The appended bibliography of Lockhart's critical writings is, as far as such things can be, authoritative: the difficulty of compiling it can perhaps only be appreciated by those who have tried to disentangle similar complexities of authorship and ascription.

E. C. B.

Henry James's Criticism by Morris Roberts (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1929. pp. 131. \$3) is an admirable little volume which forms a welcome addition to that ever-increasing body of works dealing with literary criticism. To admirers of the novels of Henry James it will come as a reminder of his excellence as a critic; for others it will supply a valuable collection of illuminating artistic doctrines and judgments. And altogether it may be said that Mr Roberts is happy in his subject and treatment alike; his work though of slight proportions is full of interesting matter and, what is also of importance in a work on criticism, eminently readable as well. The plan he adopts is a chronological one; he traces the critic's development from the imperfect sympathies and summary judgments of the early reviews to the mature judgments of his *Partial Portraits*, his *Prefaces*, and *Notes on Novelists*. And in the course of the narrative not only is the main substance of James's criticism expounded but a wise and helpful commentary is also maintained in which influences and values are shrewdly estimated. The survey thus embraces much that is most significant in James's criticism. His ideas on the novel and on art in general, as well as his appreciations of French and English artists, are all clearly set forth; and by means of a skilful use of selected quotations many of the pronouncements are made in James's own inimitable style. In one point alone does Mr Roberts fail to do justice to his theme, and that is in his summary dismissal of James's remarks on the special technique of the novel contained in the *Prefaces*. Some account of the details of James's theory on that branch of art might reasonably have been expected. It was necessary to complete the estimate of his achievement; it would moreover have been eminently acceptable to all kinds of readers. For the rest the work as it

stands is full of good things; it is well planned and well documented, while it is also written in a vein restrained and judicial that is admirably in keeping with the subject.

J. W. H. A.

In *The Drama in Modern Wales* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1928. 96 pp.) Miss Olive Ely Hart sketches briefly the history of Welsh playwriting from 1910 to the present day. The work represents a Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School in the University of Pennsylvania; and in its pages are brought together a number of interesting facts relating to the subject. In limiting her survey to modern Welsh plays in English, that is, to plays either written in English or written first in Welsh and afterwards turned into English, the author claims that such work should be considered as part of the literature of English-speaking nations—a claim that would be disputed in certain quarters. At the same time it would probably be conceded that she has performed a useful task in reducing to some sort of unity the numerous activities of dramatists in Wales, and in collecting facts, biographical and otherwise, which are instrumental in throwing light upon that development. Without being profound, her treatment is helpful and suggestive; and as the first-fruits in a field that has not hitherto been seriously worked, it is not without its value.

J. W. H. A.

In his brief introduction to *The Bible in English Drama: an annotated List of Plays including Translations from other Languages* (New York: The New York Public Library. 1931. iv + 212 pp. \$1.00), Mr Edward D. Coleman remarks that 'Every type of the drama is represented, from the earliest liturgical plays to the most recent marionette plays and plays for radio presentation.' He adds that 'with the possible exception of Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, none of the English plays based on the Bible can be considered a great masterpiece of literature.' Indeed, one wonders how many of the entries in this carefully compiled bibliography can be considered as literature at all. We find far too many things like 'I love to tell the story' (p. 99), a 'Junior Pageant' designed for the edification of Cincinnati. It might be argued that it is not a bibliographer's task to discriminate, but the fact remains that Mr Coleman's generous interpretation of the words 'English drama' detracts considerably from the value of his bibliography as a guide to the student of that subject. The problem of classifying a multitude of plays on themes biblical and quasi-biblical has been ably tackled. A useful feature of the volume is the provision throughout, under the entry of each play, of references to reviews, monographs, and translations in all languages.

F. E. B.

Arthurian scholarship has long found its most congenial home in America. Under the able editorship of Mr John J. Parry, the 'Arthurian Group of the Modern Language Association of America' has just published the first instalment of an Arthurian bibliography: *A Biblio-*

graphy of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Years 1922-29 (New York: Modern Language Association. 1931. iii + 59 pp. 75 cents). Originally intended as a supplement to the late J. D. Bruce's *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, it has been considerably extended in scope, and very properly includes Ariosto and Boiardo. The only notable item that seems overlooked is Mistruzzi's critical edition of the *Intelligenza* (Bologna, 1928), with S. Debenedetti's review of it (*Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, xciv) raising an interesting point concerning a possible allusion to the *Cligés* of Chrétien de Troyes. The publication, of which we are promised annual supplementary lists, will prove of great value to Arthurian students.

E. G. G.

The fifth volume of the great edition of Rabelais edited by M. Abel Lefranc and his colleagues (Paris: H. Champion. 1931. cviii + 391 pp. 140 fr.) has at last appeared. It contains the *Tiers Livre* with a long introduction by M. Lefranc, of which chapter II (pp. xxxi-lxix) has been already noticed in this *Review* (ix, pp. 543 ff.) with the rest of the author's *Grands Écrivains Français de la Renaissance*. Pages xlvii-lv, however, which relate to the controversy on spiritual love, have been modified in accordance with M. Gohin's preface to his admirable edition of Héroët. Chapters I and III have appeared in various separate studies. Chapter I records the life of Rabelais from 1534 to 1546, but with two gaps, one from July, 1538, to July, 1540, and the other from the middle of 1543 to September 19, 1545 (date of the privilege of the Third Book), during both of which Rabelais altogether disappears from our view. M. Lefranc dwells with emphasis on the high repute in which he was held at this time, at once as a philosophical thinker, a man of learning, a writer, and a physician. He was also greatly in favour with the royal circle, and this favour he repaid by warmly supporting the royal policy, especially in the Prologue to his new book. At the end of the chapter M. Lefranc notes—and this is important—the evolution that has taken place in Rabelais's characters. Gargantua and Pantagruel are no longer more or less symbolical giants, but human beings with well-defined characteristics. In Panurge we see not only development but actual change. He is not more virtuous, but, though he is now a coward whereas formerly he was brave, he is less ignoble, and his character has become, like Falstaff's in the hands of Shakespeare, more philosophical and of wider import. In the third chapter the chief points to notice are the practically certain identification of Raminagrobis with Jean Le Maire de Belges and the very plausible identification of Hippodathée with Lefèvre d'Étaples. Of the rest of the volume it need only be said that M. Porcher is responsible for the text and that MM. Clouzot, Plattard, and Delaunay have given to the notes the mature fruits of their long study of the master. One small point: Giovanni Andrea (chap. xxxvii), the greatest of the Canonists, was not of the fifteenth century but of the fourteenth; he died of the plague in 1348. As regards the story of the ghost of the Provost's wife in chap. xxiii W. F. Smith points out that it is recorded

not only by H. Estienne, but by Sleidan in his *De Statu religionis et reipublicae* (1534), by G. Buchanan in his poem *Franciscanus*, and by R. Scot in his *Discovery of Witchcraft* (1584). A. T.

Like the previous volume of his *Histoire de la Poésie française*, which dealt with La Fontaine (see vol. xxvi of this *Review*, p. 210), Faguet's *Boileau* (Paris: Boivin. 1931. xvii + 341 pp. 15 fr.) is not so much a continuous exposition as a series of essays. It should be read carefully by every student of French Literature, for it is full of information and sound criticism. I would call special attention to the chapters on Boileau's character (II), on Boileau as a theorist of realistic art (VIII), and on the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns (X and XI), and to the general judgment on Boileau's critical work which concludes the volume. Professor Saintsbury's remark that 'morose arrogance' was Boileau's 'chief characteristic' expresses an idea commonly held in this country. It is true that Boileau, largely owing to deafness and asthma, was morose in his later years, but in his prime 'his disinterestedness, his generosity, and his charity were,' as Faguet says, 'almost proverbial' and 'he was perhaps the most brilliant controversialist of the whole century.' These qualities combine with 'his lively, if not brusque, frankness and his great candour' to make him an attractive as well as a fine character. Faguet gives high praise to the Twelfth Epistle, *Sur l'Amour de Dieu*, and to certain passages in the Twelfth Satire, *Sur l'Équivoque*, which are, he says, with *Polyeucte* and *Athalie* a complete refutation of Boileau's theory that you must not mix up religion with poetry. In chapter VIII, he discusses with profit what Boileau meant by *raison*, pointing out that it is practically equivalent to what is reasonable or in conformity with ordinary human nature, and that for Boileau and his contemporaries 'nature' and 'reason' were almost synonymous terms. As in a previous volume, he praises Brebœuf as the greatest lyrical poet of the seventeenth century—inferior to Malherbe in purity of form, but superior to him in intensity of passion. This may be true as a comparison, but I doubt whether any English reader would regard the author of *Entretiens Solitaires* any more than Malherbe as a great lyrical poet.

A. T.

In *La Leggenda del san Graal nel romanzo in prosa di Tristano* (Geneva, Olshki. 1931. 18 pp.), an extract from Vol. xv of the *Archivum Romanicum*, Dr P. H. Coronedi studies the infiltration of the Grail legend into the Tristan romance, an infiltration common to the French cyclic texts but in Italian found only in the *Tavola Ritonda* where it is employed with notable dramatic effect. He finds the ultimate purpose of this infiltration in the exaltation of the hero, who, since he cannot be depicted as a rival of Galahad, is given the descent from Bron, the kinsman of Joseph of Arimathea, while the introduction of the quest into the thread of the romance aids its development. The latter point is very strikingly exemplified in the *Tavola Ritonda*. E. G. G.

In the preface to his *Gotisch Handboek (Oudgermaansche Handboeken, III. Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 1931. xix + 283 pp. 9 fl.)* Professor A. G. van Hamel explains that this book is meant to take the place in Holland of Braune's *Gotische Grammatik* and Wright's *Gothic Primer*. Since this is a second edition the attempt seems to have been successful. It is a pity that Professor van Hamel has reintroduced the term 'indo-germaansch' instead of 'indoeuropeesch,' the term employed in the other books of the series and in his own first edition. The grammar is clearly arranged and well presented. References to other Indo-European languages have been, as far as possible, rigorously excluded. Twenty-one pages are devoted to a discussion of Gothic syntax and twelve to word-formation. The latter appears to be a somewhat meagre allowance since phonology is given seventy pages. Phonology has its proper place in grammar, but do students require the elaborate details which are always given under this head? Concise statement of the facts and reference to works where fuller details may be found are surely sufficient. Space would thus be set free for a more generous treatment of word-formation and syntax. The accompanying texts, printed without any indication of vowel-length, bring some extracts that are not usually found in Gothic grammars and readers. There is a full glossary. F. N.

A new field is invaded by the advanced text-book for schools in *Das Nibelungenlied*, edited by Max Diez (New York: Prentice-Hall. 1931. 441 pp. \$2.25). Dr Diez prints an abridged version of Karl Simrock's translation (pp. 3-206), adds a history of the story (pp. 210-71), sources illustrating the text (pp. 273-322), short bibliography and questions on the text (pp. 327-40), themes for essays (pp. 341-9), grammatical notes (pp. 350-6), Index and Glossary (pp. 359-431). The history of the story presents A. Heusler's conclusions in a lucid and simple form; the sources illustrating the text give other saga accounts, extracts dealing with mediæval life and manners, and modern German versions of some Minnesongs. Why does Dr Diez, following Obermann, make the Kürnberger say: 'Wenn in meiner Kammer ich steh so ganz allein' ('Swenne ich stân alleine in mînem hemedē')? The modern version of the *Hildebrandslied* also needs some correction in a future edition, particularly: 'dasz du nicht aus dem Reiche vor Rache entwichest' ('reccheo ni wurti'). But these are minor blemishes in a useful text-book. F. N.

There has been some activity of late in Low German studies, and a welcome proof of this interest is shown by *Mittelniederdeutsche Fastnachtspiele*, herausgegeben von Wilhelm Seelmann (*Drucke des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung*, 1. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz. 1931. 136 pp. M. 2.70). This is the second edition of a book which first appeared in 1885. The preface to the first edition is reprinted verbatim, and in the notes on the seven Fastnachtspiele contained in the volume there is hardly a reference to work later than 1900 although much has been done during the last thirty years in the field of Middle Low German. It is a

tribute to that veteran scholar, Professor Seelmann, that in spite of these shortcomings the notes contain much that is useful and instructive. As, however, the book is intended for students, notes referring to more recent literature on the subject and a glossary would be welcome in the next edition.

F. N.

The series of the *Bibliothèque de la Revue de la littérature comparée* makes a new departure with its seventy-first volume. This is a translation by Dr Maurice Mutterer of Goethe's *Italienische Reise* (*Voyage en Italie*, Traduction nouvelle complète avec notes. Paris: H. Champion. 1931. 547 pp. 80 fr.), which apparently had not been translated into French—and then only in selection, since 1855. Dr Mutterer's translation has, as far as we have tested it, been made with the greatest care; occasionally, when he feels that his rendering is not exact enough, he gives the original text in a footnote. The explanatory notes, culled mostly from German annotated editions, give the impression that the translator has in view a more general public than that to which the *Bibliothèque* appeals; but the volume, strange to say, is not provided with any kind of introduction. Moritz's name (p. 145) was not 'Jean Philippe,' and surely it is misleading to describe plays like *Erwin und Elmire* as 'opérettes.'

J. G. R.

The dissertation by Dr Kathleen Cunningham, *Schiller und die französische Klassik* (Bonn: K. Schroeder. 1930), is a satisfactory and interesting piece of work. Until quite recent years, little attention was paid to the possible connexions between the German and the French classical dramatists. Then, in 1917, Korff wrote on *Voltaire im literarischen Deutschland des XVIII Jahrhunderts*, and since that there have been various other studies, similar to this, none of which, however, have exhausted the subject. Dr Cunningham proceeds by means of a chronological investigation of the theoretical and practical connexion of Schiller with the French, and, examining her subject in considerable detail, she brings to light some remarkable similarities, as for example between *Maria Stuart* and *Britannicus*. She concludes, as one might expect, that Schiller definitely turned away from Shakespeare and towards the *haute tragédie* in the third version of *Don Carlos*, that the succeeding period in his work shows the closest relationship, now to Racine, now to Corneille, and that the last works of all tend to diverge from French models again. She also decides (and this is one of the most interesting results of her research) that, although Schiller expressed greater approval of Racine, and tended to follow him more closely in externals, he is really more akin to Corneille.

A. H. J. K.

SHORTHAND AND THE BAD SHAKESPEARE
QUARTOS

THE theory that the bad quartos of Shakespeare's plays were transcriptions of shorthand notes taken down during the performance of the plays, although it has received detailed study only in Germany, is of English origin. Many English editors of the last century, chief among whom were Dyce, Phelps, Collier and Malone, accounted for the corrupt state of the quartos by assuming that they were faulty transcriptions of bad shorthand notes. Malone's comment on the 1600 quarto of *Henry V* may be taken as typical: 'the inference to be drawn,' he said, 'is that a person taking down the words of the play as the actor delivered them for the purpose of publishing the quarto of 1600 misread what was said and used wrong words which in sound nearly resembled the right.'

Apart from the work of Matthias Levy¹, these generalisations have not been followed up in England by any detailed examination. In Germany, however, a considerable amount of detailed study has been devoted to the theory, and its protagonists claim to have secured a widespread acceptance of their views in that country. The theory was first supported by Dr Curt Dewischeit in a treatise in the 1898 volume of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*². In this and subsequent articles Dr Dewischeit has sought to prove not only that shorthand was used for the quartos, but also that the reporter used Characterie, the system of Dr Timothy Bright. His theories have been adopted by a number of younger German scholars and applied to all the bad quartos. The enquiry has also been extended to other Elizabethan plays: in *Zur Entstehung der Quartausgabe des First Part of Jeronimo*³, for example, A. Seeberger has applied the theory to Kyd, and in other articles in the *Archiv für Stenographie* similar attempts have been made to account for textual errors in Marlowe and other dramatists. The outstanding contributions to the subject other than those named above are P. Friedrich's study of Timothy Bright's Characterie in *Studien zur englischen Stenographie im Zeitalter Shakespeare* (1914), and H. T. Price's *The Text of Henry V* (1921) and *A fruitful sermon...* (1922).

The views expressed in these articles and monographs have found

¹ *Shakespeare and Shorthand*, 1884; *William Shakespeare and Timothy Bright*, 1910; and a number of articles in shorthand periodicals.

² *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, 1898, pp. 170-220.

³ *Archiv für Stenographie*, 1908, pp. 236 ff.

little acceptance in England, it being generally held that the theory fails to account for reminiscent passages in the quartos, and for the good passages which they contain. The strong case against the theory on shorthand grounds has, however, never been stated even in Germany, and the object of this paper is to repair that omission.

The argument used by Dewischeit and his followers is based primarily on Thomas Heywood's statement that one of his plays was pirated by a shorthand writer and on other contemporary statements which seem to support that assertion. These are reinforced by the fact that in 1590 and 1591 certain sermons were pirated by writers who took them down in Characterie. Characterie was the name of a system of shorthand invented by Timothy Bright and published in 1588. Until 1600 only one other system of shorthand was published, but this was quite impracticable, and it is, therefore, argued that if shorthand were used for the quartos—that shorthand must have been Bright's Characterie. This was a defective system, liable to yield several kinds of typical mistakes in transcriptions. Many mistakes of this nature are shown in the bad quartos, sufficient, it is claimed, to prove the theory that the quartos are transcriptions of Characterie notes. In what follows the main points of this argument are amplified and the objections put.

Of the contemporary statements quoted as evidence the following three alone are relevant.

(1) In the Epistle to the *Rape of Lucrece* (1608) Thomas Heywood justified the double sale of his labours because some of his plays had come into the printer's hands 'and therefore so corrupt and mangled, (copied onely by the eare)' that he could scarcely recognise them.

(2) In 1637 Heywood in the prologue to *The Play of Queen Elizabeth* (i.e., *If You Know not Me, You Know No Body*, first published in 1605) complained that:

Some by stenography drew
The plot: put it in print: (scarce one word trew).

(3) Sir George Buck in *The Third Universitie of England* (1612) asserted that 'they which know (brachygraphy) can readily take a Sermon, Oration, Play, or any long speech, as they are spoke, dictated, acted and uttered in the instant.'

Even these quotations give very little support to the theory that the quartos are shorthand reports. 'Copied by the eare' by no means necessarily implies that shorthand was used, and although in 1637 Heywood directly accuses a writer of stenography he was then writing thirty-two years after the pirated edition was published. The great development of

shorthand affords a ready explanation of why Heywood should have come from the general to the particular after this lapse of time: in 1608 there had been printed only four systems of shorthand, but by 1637 at least a dozen other systems had been published, some of which had gone into several editions. In those twenty-nine years shorthand had progressed enormously in scope and popularity. Individual reporters had achieved considerable fame, and the art gave employment to numerous writing masters, some of whom taught in the neighbourhood of the theatres. In 1608 Heywood might have been unaware of stenography but could hardly have been so in 1637.

Sir George Buck's statement is more topical, but it was published some time after the appearance of the bad quartos, in the Willis era of shorthand (four editions of John Willis's *Art of Stenographie* were published between 1602 and 1617). Moreover, Buck claimed for shorthand more than the inventors claimed in their own puffs, for they usually insisted that for verbatim reporting, the speaker should utter his words 'treatably.'

The earliest history of shorthand in England is rather vague, but we have good reason to believe that private shorthands were used prior to the appearance of any published system, for reports exist of speeches made early in the sixteenth century. Among the reporters of whose activities we have record are John Jewel, Thomas Some and Thomas Norton. Jewel, who later became Bishop of Salisbury, was, according to Humphrey's *Life of Jewel* (1573), employed as reporter at the disputations of Peter the Martyr, Cranmer and others, while Some was the recorder of Latimer's famous Friday sermons. In the dedication to the Sermon of March 8, 1549, Some explained that the report was not 'so exactly done as he dyd speake it, for in very dede I am not able so to do: to write word for word as he dyd speake¹.' Thomas Norton is known to us from the fact that in 1571 a place was specially reserved for him in Westminster Hall in order that he might take notes of the trial of the Duke of Norfolk. References of this kind make it highly probable that private systems of shorthand were being used from the middle of the sixteenth century.

The first system to be published was Dr Timothy Bright's *Characterie* (1588). Prior to its publication Bright had been granted a Royal Patent which gave him a fifteen years' monopoly of teaching and publishing shorthand, saving only the rights of shorthands already known. Bright's book did not reach a second edition, but two years later there appeared

¹ Cf. Chapter I of A. T. Wright's *John Willis and Edmond Willis*, 1926.

Peter Bales's *The Writing Schoolmaster*, of which the third part contained a shorthand system called 'Brachygraphy.' This was republished in 1597 and was followed in 1600 by the same author's second system, *A New Year's Gift for England*. The fact that Bales's shorthand was published so soon after *Characterie*, despite Bright's patent, makes it probable that Bales practised it prior to 1588. The third author was John Willis, whose *Art of Stenographie* appeared anonymously in 1602: this system held the field until 1618 when Edmond Willis's *An Abbreviation of Writing by Character* appeared.

Of the four earliest published systems, John Willis's is by far the best. It was the first alphabetic shorthand and was the basis for over a hundred systems published in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: it is almost true to say that until the development of phonetic shorthand all stenographies were but modifications of Willis's. Bales's first system, although it was, to judge from contemporary references and the fact that two editions were published, more popular than Bright's, is rejected by all critics as thoroughly impracticable.

Of published systems there remain, therefore, only Bright's and Willis's to consider in connexion with the quartos.

The German scholars plump for Bright, but Willis has the support of Van Dam¹ and, apparently, of Matthias Levy. Although Levy does not try to establish the claims of any individual system, his examples assume the use of an alphabetic shorthand, of which the only published example was then John Willis's. Since, however, any other alphabetic shorthand would yield the same type of mistake as Willis's stenography, proof of the use of alphabetic shorthand does not necessarily imply that Willis's shorthand was used.

In alphabetic shorthand signs are used representing all the letters of the alphabet, and words are spelled in those signs according to the usual orthography except where that does not represent the pronunciation. Initial vowels and all consonants were expressed by these signs, but medial vowels were expressed by disjoining the following consonant signs and placing them in various positions about the preceding consonant sign. There were five positions, corresponding to the five vowels (diphthongs were modified into the nearest simple vowels). The top position usually was reserved for *a* and the bottom for *u*, the three side positions being used for *e*, *i* and *o*. Thus $\overset{i}{b}$ = *but*, b^i = *bet*, bi = *bit*, b_i = *boat*, b = *but*. A transcription from alphabetical shorthand would, therefore,

¹ *The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet*, 1924.

be liable to show words which, because of errors of position, had the right consonants but the wrong vowels.

Mr Van Dam has not worked out his theory in detail, but Mr Levy¹ has discovered (chiefly in Collier's notes) some mistakes that might have been caused by the use of alphabetic shorthand. The following are among the best of his examples:

The time has been my senses would have cool'd
To hear a night shriek. *Macbeth*, v, 5 (1623).

In 1632 *cooled* was amended to *quailed*. According to Levy the shorthand form for both might well have been *kld*, but in all the early shorthand documents I have read I have never come across examples of the substitution of *k* for *q*, except in words like *acquittal* and *banquet*, where *k* represented the true pronunciation.

I dizen'd him
And pinn'd a plum in's forehead.
Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Pilgrim*, iv, 3.

The signs for *plume* and *plum* were, in all alphabetic shorthands, the same.

This is thy sheath, there rest and let me die.
Romeo and Juliet, v, 3 (1597).

In later editions *rest* was amended to *rust*. Such an error might be the result of this kind of shorthand.

Levy also quotes from Collier an example of a possible mishearing:

Bianco. You're an ass,
You must have things all construed.
Tranio. And pierc'd too.
Beaumont and Fletcher, *Woman's Prize*, iv, 3.

The shorthand for *pierced* would be *p^{rsd}*, which might be a mistake for *p^{rsd}* = *parsed*.

These examples and the few others that Levy quotes are culled from various Elizabethan plays, but it is very difficult to see what they prove. Often the shorthand solution suggested by Levy is wrong, and always there is a far simpler explanation. If two or three suitable errors prove the use of shorthand, then it should be simple to prove that a great percentage of printed books have a similar origin.

Alphabetic shorthand, and in particular John Willis's stenography, deserve better treatment than they have so far received. In considering Willis's system in connexion with the bad quartos, however, there is one critical fact about it, namely, that it was not published until 1602, while the bad quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* was published in 1597, that

¹ *Shakespeare and Shorthand*, 1884.

of *Henry V* in 1600 and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* in 1602. Van Dam, who believed that it was possible to take Bright's system too seriously, has argued that Willis may have evolved and taught his system after he left Cambridge (he graduated at Christ's College in 1592, and became rector of St Mary Bothaw in 1601). This is possible, but, I think, improbable in view of Bright's monopoly of publishing and teaching shorthand. Willis was a very respectable cleric waiting for a living in London, and he would have had little desire to run so counter to his own interests as to teach shorthand contrary to Royal decree. It was for this very reason that his *Art of Stenographie* of 1602 was published anonymously, although then Bright's patent had only a year to go.

In the absence of concrete evidence, therefore, the probabilities incline one to the belief that Willis's stenography of 1602 is unconnected with the earlier bad quartos, although the labour of examining the first quartos of *Hamlet* and *Pericles* in connexion with his system might be well repaid.

Reasoning of this kind has led the Germans to rely upon Bright's *Characterie* to support the shorthand theory. They believe that evidence of its use for reporting is to be found in the following sermons discovered by R. Thomson Cooper¹ and others:

Andrew Maunsell's catalogue of English printed books (1595, p. 99) includes: *Steph. Egerton his lecture (taken by Characterie) on Gen. 12 vers. 17, 18, 19, 20: 1589*. In 1603 this sermon (no copy of which is now known) was reprinted in an amended form and a copy is in the Bodleian Library. In his preface to the 1603 edition Egerton points to the probability that the 1589 copy was poor, for the later edition was issued 'somewhat to qualife an error that cannot be recalled.' He adds that in his experience 'the swiftest hand cometh often short of the slowest tongue.'

The other pirated sermons were preached by Henry Smith. They are, among others:

1590. *A Sermon of the Benefite of Contentation. By H. Smyth. Taken by characterie. London. Printed by Roger Ward for John Proctor.*

This was reprinted in an amended form in the same year... *Taken by characterie, and examined after. London. Printed by Abell Jeffes for Roger Ward.* Stimulated by the appearance of these unauthorised copies, Smith issued his own version in 1591, *The benefite of contentation. Newly examined, and corrected by the author. London. Printed by Abell Jeffes.*

¹ Cf. *Notes and Queries*, 1896, No. 245, pp. 189-190.

In the preface to this, Smith said he had taken as much trouble as illness would allow him to 'perfit the matter and to correct the print.'

Smith's Wedding Garment sermon was also pirated and also issued by Smith himself in a corrected edition in 1590. According to his preface, the pirated copy was 'patched as it seemeth out of borrowed notes.'

In 1591 also appeared *A fruitfull Sermon... By Henrie Smith. Which sermon being taken by Characterie, is now published for the benefite of the faithfull. At London, Printed for Nicholas Ling. 1591.* The authentic version of this sermon was published in the same year, and both sermons have been reprinted, with an introduction by H. T. Price, in *A Fruitfull Sermon*, 1922.

The phrase 'taken by characterie' is held by supporters of the Bright theory to mean that Bright's shorthand was used to pirate these sermons. From this assumption they go on to argue that Characterie was capable of taking down rapid speech, and consequently that it could have been used to pirate Shakespeare's plays.

The primary assumption in this argument is open to doubt, but the meaning of Characterie as used in the sermons is discussed later. It is first necessary to examine Bright's shorthand for really typical errors and to discover how far it could produce a reliable report. Good accounts of Characterie are given by Friedrich (*op. cit.*) and by W. J. Carlton in *Timothe Bright*, 1911, and the following account largely follows that given by Mr Carlton (to whom acknowledgments are due for a number of other facts contained in this paper).

Bright's was not an alphabetical system in the sense of following orthography, but it had, nevertheless, an alphabet of signs (eighteen in number, *c, k; s, z; u, v, w* and *i, j, y* being grouped, with one sign for each group). To the end of each of these eighteen signs could be attached a hook, stroke, circle, etc. Of these end-signs there were twelve, so that there were twelve variants of each sign, each of which could be written horizontally, vertically or inclined to left or to right. Thus each original sign was capable of 48 variants. Not all the variants were used for every letter, and the total in the volume of 1588 was 537. Each of the 537 signs had assigned to it a commonly used word called a 'Charactericall word' (i.e., 'certaine wordes whereto all other may bee referred'). Thus the variant signs based upon the original sign for *a* all corresponded to Charactericall words beginning with *a*; those based upon *b* represented words beginning with *b*, and so on.

To write words other than these 537, various methods were adopted, of which the chief is the synonym method. At the end of *Characterie* is

a Table of Appellative Words, in which examples of the Charactericall words are given, each followed by a list of synonyms. For example *aer* has grouped under it the words *breath*, *exhalation*, *miste*, *reeke*, *steame*, *vapour*. Colour is followed by *black*, *blewe*, *carnation*, *crimson*, *redde*, *russet*, *scarlet*, *tawney*, *white*, *yellowe*. The book also contains a fairly lengthy vocabulary which refers all the words contained in it to their Charactericall words, e.g.,

abandon	<i>forsake</i>	abashe	<i>blush</i>	abbey	<i>companie</i>
abase	<i>high</i>	abate	<i>great</i>	abbote	<i>bishop</i>

Here the Charactericall words are italicised.

To write the shorthand sign for any of these synonyms, one had to write the appropriate Charactericall word and to write in small on the left-hand side of it the initial letter of the synonym. Thus the above synonyms for *aer* would be written ^b*aer* (*breath*); ^e*aer* (*exhalation*); ^m*aer* (*miste*); ^r*aer* (*reeke*); ^s*aer* (*steame*); ^v*aer* (*vapour*), all, of course, written in shorthand symbols.

Not every word, however, has a synonym, and Bright provided for this by laying down that in these cases the antonym of the word should be written, and the initial letter placed on the right-hand side of the shorthand sign. Thus *up*^d = *down*; *great*^b = *brief*; *high*^a = *abase*; *gentile*^j = *jewish*; *thence*^{an} = *whence*.

Plural nouns were indicated by a dot on the right-hand side of the sign. Comparatives and superlatives were written in the positive form and afterwards determined by the sense. The tenses of verbs were expressed by dots placed in various positions about the verb, a method which was liable to cause confusion with plural nouns. In addition there were a number of 'Particles' (arbitrary signs for prepositions, etc.). Repetition of phrases was indicated by a circle for the second and subsequent repetitions. The signs were not written from left to right, but in Chinese fashion from top to bottom.

Finally, there came the rule that 'the sense only is to be taken with the character when, besides that we desire to be swift, the very express word is not necessary,' and Bright advised the omission of circumlocutions. For example, for the phrase 'creator of heaven and earth,' the writer was to put simply 'God'; for 'the redeemer of mankind,' the single word 'Christ'; for 'master, servant, children, father, mother, olde and young,' it was enough to write 'the whole familie,' and for 'he tooke himselfe to his heeles,' 'he fled' was sufficient.

The difficulty of such a system is beyond measure: the multitude of

similar Charactericall signs, whose small differences were not based upon any such principle as that which clarifies modern shorthands, all had to be learned by rote. The possibilities of complication here can only be fitly appreciated by writers of Pitman's shorthand, which has some 200 logograms (that is, arbitrary characters somewhat reminiscent of Bright's). It is rare for reporters to get even these 200 logograms all in their correct places; if there were nearly 550 of them it is highly unlikely that anyone would get them all right. In Pitman's shorthand it does not matter much, however, if the logograms are slightly out of position, because they represent words which can be deduced from the text, and because very similar logograms represent very similar words. The slightest error in any of Bright's signs, however, means that an entirely different and unconnected word has been written.

These difficulties, however, are as nought compared with that involved in writing non-Charactericall words. For any word other than the 537 and the Particles, the reporter had to perform in half a second the mental feat of assigning it to its appropriate Charactericall word, or, frequently, of deciding that it had no synonym and sorting out the Charactericall antonym. Even then he was not finished if he meant to have readable notes, for many synonyms have the same initial letter. If he was really bent upon clarity, he had to run over in his mind the whole of the synonyms with the same initial letter and to place before the Charactericall word the initial, or the first two, three or more letters necessary to distinguish that word from all others. For example the Charactericall word *skil* has for synonyms (in Bright's Table of Appellative Words alone): *baker*, *brewer*, *carpenter*, *chandler*, *clothier*, *collier*, *currier*. If the reporter wanted to write *carpenter* he would have to write *ca^sskill*, or he would not know whether he was dealing with a carpenter, a chandler, a clothier, a collier, or a currier. The Charactericall word *tree* has the following synonyms beginning with *b*: *baye*, *beech*, *birch*, *bough*, *boxe*, *branche*, *bramble*, *brier*, *broome*, *bushe*; and there are others; in fact, *tree* has so many synonyms beginning with *b* that Bright decided that confusion might result, and so made the rule that the last four words in the above list should be written with the initial *b* on the right-hand side, where one could not distinguish whether they were synonyms or antonyms.

No shorthand notes of speeches have come down to us in Bright's shorthand, but one Jane Seagar presented to Queen Elizabeth in 1589 a pretty book in vellum, in which on the left-hand pages she had written in an Italian hand *The Divine Prophecies of the Sibyls*¹, and on the right-

¹ British Museum, Add. MS. 10037.

hand pages the corresponding Characterie form of these poems. They are preceded by a dedication and concluded by the double form of a complimentary poem to the Queen.

From this book of Jane Seagar's it is possible actually to test the value of Characterie. I give below Jane Seagar's correct version of the *Sibyl of Samia* followed by the literal transcription of her shorthand for this prophecy (which I have transcribed in collation with the *Characterie* of 1588). The third verse below is her final complimentary poem to the Queen, and this is followed by a literal transcription of the corresponding shorthand which was worked out by Mr Carlton and published in his book on Bright.

SAMIA.

Behold the cheerfull daye shall shortly come,
Which shall remove the worldes obscurity:
Unfoulding all the Prophets' prophecies
And knotty volumes of the Jewish race:
So as the people maye declare in verse
How this great King shall touched be of men:
And how a virgine most inviolate
Shall beare, and nourish hym wth humane brest.
The Heavens of this happynes divynes;
And glistring starrs, foreshew it by y^r signes:

The literal transcription of the shorthand is:

°See the °mirth day side°ly goe°
Which °move the world light°
°loosing all the prophecy prophecies
And °rough °book of the gentile° race,
So as the people °can °declare in °singe
How this great °prince touched be of men
And how a marrie° most (inviolate)¹
Shall beare and °feede hee with °man brest.
The heavens of this °blisse ship °gods
And °bright-ing °hevens °prophecy it by there °markes.

The final poem and the corresponding shorthand transcribed by Mr Carlton is:

Lo thus in breife (most sacred maiestye)
I have sett downe whence all theis Sibells weare;
What they foretold, or saw, wee see and heare,
And profett reape by all their prophesy.
Would God I weare a Sibell to divine
In worthy vearse your lasting happynes;
Then only I should be Characteres
Of that, which worlds with wounder might defyne.
But what need I to wish, when you are such,
Of whose perfections none can write to much.

¹ I could not originally find the Charactericall word represented by this symbol; but the Bodleian copy of *Characterie* shows it to be 'holy'.

'see thus in great^b most ^sholy ^mgrace
 I have sit up^d thence^w all these sibylls were,
 What they for 'declared or saw we see and hear
 And ^pbenefit reap by all their prophecy.
 Would God I were a sibyll to ^dgod
 In worthy ^ssing your lasting ^bbliss:
 Then onely I will be characteress
 Of that which worlds with ^wmarvell ^mcan begin^d
 But what ^sscarce I to ^wdesire then^w you are such
 Of whose perfections someⁿ can write too much.

From these passages one may judge that the difficulties attendant on the writing of Bright's shorthand were surpassed only by the pains of transcription. The possibilities of error, too, seemed to be so marked that to test the error quotient of Bright's Characterie at its best, I submitted my literal transcription of the first piece above to eight graduates and undergraduates of London University, most of whom were members of the English Honours School at Birkbeck College. I have tabulated the results of their attempts to discover the right synonyms and antonyms, and in the following table the left-hand column contains the literal transcription of the shorthand form, and the right-hand column the variants given in their solutions. Not one of the solutions made sense, although the solvers took great pains.

SHORTHAND FORM	RIGHT FORM	SOLUTIONS
^b see	behold	behold (8 times)
^c mirth	cheerfull	cheerful (8)
side ^s ly	shortly	straightly (2); six blanks
^r move	remove	roam, rove, revolve, revive, remove (4)
light ^o	obscurity	obscure (3), opaque, oblivion, ombres, obscurity (2)
^u loosing	unfouling	unleashing, unloosing, untying, unlocking, undoing (4)
^k rough	knotty	crude, coarse (2), knotty; four blanks
^v book	volumes	verses (2), volume (6)
gentile ⁱ	Jewish	jewish (8)
^m can	maye	might, may (7)
^r declare ¹	declare	reveal (3), relate (2), resolve, record, report
^v singe	verse	voice (5), verse (3)
^k prince	king	king (8)
marrie ^v	virgine	victor, virgin (5); two blanks
ⁿ feede	nourish	nurse, nurture (2), nourish (5)
^h man	humane	husband, heroic, human (6)
^b blisseship	happyness	holyness, happy ship (2), happiness (5)
^d gods	divines	deities, divine (5); two blanks
^s bright-ing	glistring	gleaming (4), glittering, glistening, glancing, glorious, glowing
^s heavens	starrs	skies (6), spheres (2)
^f prophesey	foreshew	fulfill, fortell (7)
^s marks	signes	signs (8)

These transcriptions show a total synonym and antonym error of 51 per cent. The best solution had nine mistakes out of twenty-three.

¹ A slip of Jane Seagar's.

The lists do not, of course, exhaust the possibilities of error, for several of the words could give other appropriate synonyms.

Errors of synonyms and antonyms do not comprise the whole of the possible errors in Bright's shorthand. Even more prolific would be errors of tenses, pronouns and number of nouns. I have had no means of making a practical test of those such as I used for the synonyms, because to test them would necessitate a knowledge of the shorthand itself on the part of those tested. I should imagine, however, that errors of this kind would show nearly the same percentage of error as the synonyms.

Another source of error is abbreviation, which is advised by Bright for swiftness and which would certainly be required if Characterie users were taking down the rapid speech of actors. In the *Sibyls* there is little abbreviation, but in other shorthand manuscripts of men writing before 1650 which I have examined, it is a striking feature. Early manuscripts in shorthand consist almost entirely of versions of the Bible or Psalms, and although these were written at leisure they are, nevertheless, always abbreviated. The following literal transcription of a shorthand version of the 23rd Psalm is made from the manuscript in the British Museum (Add. MS. 39582) written about 1640 in Henry Dix's shorthand; it is a fairly typical example of abbreviation in the early shorthands:

1. The Lord is my shepherd I shall not want.
2. He makes me to lie down in green pastures he leadeth me beside still waters.
3. He restoreth he leadeth me the paths right(eous)ness for his names sake.
4. Yea though walk through the valley shadow death fear no evil for art with me thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.
5. Thou preparest ta(b)le before me the presence mine enemies thou anoint my head my cup runneth over.
6. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all days my life and I dwell house lord for ever.

Reports may have been even more abbreviated.

Thus in computing the utility of Bright's system we must consider: (1) the tremendous grasp of English vocabulary required by the stenographer; (2) the degree of mental alertness necessary to assign words to their true Charactericall words; (3) the difficulty of learning and of distinguishing between over 550 words (if particles are included) which have very similar signs; (4) the slowness of the system caused by the method of writing in columns and the necessity of moving the hand backwards to write the initial letters. These four points make it highly improbable, I think, that anyone could have written the system at anything like the speed necessary for taking down even a slow speech. Finally the error quotient of approximately 50 per cent. for the synonyms

and antonyms, and possibly as much for pronouns, tenses, plurals and singulars of nouns, etc., together with the probability of omissions, make it in the highest degree unlikely that, even if it had been possible to take down speech in Characterie, anything but the most corrupt of transcriptions would have been possible. The transcriptions from the *Prophecies of the Sibyls* show an error quotient of 50 per cent., but it must be remembered that the shorthand of these was written at leisure; Jane Seagar had as much time as she required to choose the right Charactericall word and to correct her shorthand (a fact which may account for the fewness of abbreviations in her shorthand). Verbatim notes would be very much rougher than these and would consequently be liable to a far greater percentage of errors.

The opinions held about Characterie by two English authorities on shorthand are perhaps worth quoting: J. H. Lewis in his *Historical Account* (1816) asserted that 'to acquire a knowledge of the art by this method in such a degree of perfection as to render it at all useful, as much time and attention must have been requisite as is necessary for the accomplishment of a new language.' Mr W. J. Carlton, in his book on Bright, says that 'in such circumstances, transcription must have been largely a matter of guesswork, and imagination reels at the thought of the confusion that would arise if the proceedings in our Houses of Parliament and courts of law had to be reported by such a system as Timothy Bright's.' Yet it is curious to find Mr Carlton accepting at its face value the statement that the sermons previously mentioned were 'taken by characterie.'

Until the discovery of these sermons, the above quotations fairly represented the view taken of Characterie by writers on shorthand (cf. also the *Histories* of Anderson and Pitman). The sermons which R. Thomson Cooper discovered gave, however, to Dewiseheit and his followers a reason for disregarding the defects of Characterie: they assumed that the word *Characterie* used in the title of the sermons means Bright's shorthand, and argued that it was consequently good enough for taking down speeches, and (from Price's analysis in *A Fruitfull Sermon*) that it was good enough to yield a pretty accurate transcript from verbatim notes.

Price's comparison of the pirated version and the authentic version of *A Fruitfull Sermon* is the soundest piece of work done on this subject, and his analysis yields some interesting facts. In the pirated text the wrong synonyms are few, a dozen at most; there are few omissions other than whole passages which seem clearly to have been inserted later by

Henry Smith, but there is a good crop of errors in pronouns, tenses, plurals for singulars and singulars for plurals. The last group of mistakes causes Price to deduce that the earlier text was, as it claimed to be, a transcript from shorthand notes, although apparently he had to overcome considerable doubts before arriving at this conclusion. The shorthand used he assumes to have been Bright's, and since the pirated text is on the whole so good, he concludes that Characterie was capable of producing even the good passages in the quartos.

These arguments, however, require examination. The typical error which would differentiate Bright's shorthand from any other early shorthand is the wrong synonym. By showing the considerable number of mistakes in tenses, pronouns, etc., Price, even if he produced support for his opinion that shorthand was used, did not prove that it was Bright's shorthand. All the early shorthands were weak on these points: pronouns were expressed in other early shorthands by dots placed about the verb; the form of the verb was often left to be inferred from its subject; plurals, like pronouns, were usually expressed by dots about a word. Mistakes of this kind might arise from the use of the systems of Theophilus Metcalfe, John Willis, Edmond Willis or Henry Reginald, to name only a few of the shorthands of the early seventeenth century, and if shorthands other than Bright's and Bales's were being used in 1590 and 1591, it is only reasonable to presume that they too would have given rise to similar mistakes. Thus, the only guide to a transcription from Bright's shorthand is a large proportion of wrong synonyms. But in the pirated sermons these are few.

Professor A. W. Pollard in his review of Price's book (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, April, 1924) suggested that an attempt should be made to see whether the type of mistake which Price had shown in the pirated sermon could be found in any text where there was no question of shorthand having been used. Price, in *The Text of Henry V* (1921), referred to such a text, the first edition of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*.

The textual notes appended to the Oxford edition of Spenser's *Poems* show that Elizabethan printers could commit printing errors extraordinarily similar to those given by Price in his analysis of the sermons. The 1924 Oxford edition (pp. 644 ff.) gives a lengthy list of such mistakes, containing synonym errors (even in rhymes) and errors of pronouns, errors of tenses and errors of number of nouns. The following are characteristic examples:

Synonym errors: (1) in rhymes: sport (play); upheave (uprear); age (times); place (stead); hyre (meed). (2) in the line: ebbe (spring); amble

(trample); fits (sits); seely (feeble); piteous (pretious); face (place); feared (scared); singed (swinged); labour (dolour); avenging (revenging); bloudy (boldly); advise (device); hurle (hurtle); prickling (pricking); abstaine (restraine); hills (heapes); revive (survive); infest (unrest); earnest (heed-full); fearfully (tenderly); failing (fading); captive (caytive); sad (bad); wicked (wretched); aet (deed); ornaments (implements); sought (bought); praise (loos); gentle (learned); cleanest (clearest).

Errors of pronouns: these abound and include: thee (you); this (his); his (her); her (his); their (her); hee (shee); him (them).

Errors of number: natives (native); pleasures (pleasure); feasts (feast): and many others.

Other mistakes similar to those given by Price are: passeth (passed); yelded (yelled); song (sung); never (ever); one (none).

This printer's pie gives support to a remark of Thomas Heywood, interesting because he is so much to be thanked for the controversy. In the postscript to *An Apology for Actors* (1612) he speaks of 'the infinite faults. . . in [his] booke of Britaines Troy by the negligence of the printer, as the misquotations, mistaking of sillables, misplacing halfe lines, coining of strange and never heard of words, these being without number.'

It is only the phrase 'taken by characterie' which gives direct evidence of the use of shorthand for the sermons. Smith himself never mentioned shorthand but suggested that the pirated version of the Wedding Garment sermon was 'patched out of borrowed notes.' But, if we assume that shorthand was used, we may make two deductions: that Smith's corrected version was based on the pirated text (which may or may not have been transcribed from Characterie notes), and was not printed from his own script; or that the absence of a large number of wrong synonyms points to the use of a shorthand other than Bright's.

Grounds for believing the first deduction can be found in the sermon *Benefite of Contentation*, the second pirated copy of which was printed by Abell Jeffes for Roger Ward. Smith's authentic text of the next year was also printed by Abell Jeffes and was 'newly examined and corrected by the author.' In the preface to this edition, Smith said that he had taken pains to 'perfit the matter and to correct the print.' This apparently means that he adopted the text of the pirated copy and merely corrected it, and this may well have been his method for *A Fruitfull Sermon*. If this is so, it is easy to understand the differences between the pirated and the authentic text as shown by Price. Gross errors of pronouns, tenses, etc., would obviously be corrected, but synonyms

which, although they were wrong according to the sermon as it was preached, were adequate to express the meaning, would escape notice by a corrector who was not amending from his own notes of the sermon as it was first delivered. If this is what happened, we have no means of telling how many more synonym errors existed in the pirated sermon, and, therefore, the argument that the sermons prove that Bright's shorthand was good enough to give a correct transcription is unjustified.

The second deduction turns upon the meaning of the word *characterie*. Bright was the first person to publish a system of shorthand and to give a name to it. The word *characterie* appears for the first time as the title of his book. It is likely, however, as we have already seen, that his was not the first English shorthand. There were probably other shorthand writers than Thomas Some, Jewel, Norton and Bales; for Bright's patent did not forbid others to write shorthand even if it were invented after the date of the patent, it only forbade them to publish or teach such shorthand. In 1590 and 1591 there were probably several nameless systems being practised. Until the appearance of Willis's word *stenographie* there were only two titles for shorthand, Bright's word *characterie* and Bales's *brachygraphy*. It is not unreasonable to assume that other writers of shorthand, wishing to advertise their craft in view of its new importance, should have adopted one or other of those titles for their own work, and consequently that *brachygraphy* and *characterie* should have assumed the quality of generic names. The word *characterie* was in fact so used as a generic name for shorthand in the first half of the seventeenth century. John Willis called his system 'The Art of Stenographie or Short Writing by spelling characterie'; Edmond Willis's system is called 'An Abbreviation of Writing by Character' (1618); in the dedication to the 1659 edition of Thomas Shelton's *Zeiglographia* the author speaks of that system as 'surpassing all former ways of characterie yet extant'; and John Farthing (*Short Writing Shortned*, 1684, p. 2) says 'now in characterie man may write even as fast as think.' There are other similar uses of the word, and in addition almost all writers spoke of their signs as *characters* (cf. John Willis, Edmond Willis, Henry Dix, etc.). Shakespeare's only instances of the word (*Julius Caesar*, II, I, 308 and *Merry Wives of Windsor*, V, 5, 77) seem to mean 'symbols' and he was probably using a word already familiar. No one seems to assume that all the early references to *brachygraphy* apply to Bales's system only, and there seems to be reason to think that 'taken by characterie' may merely mean 'taken by shorthand' without reference to any individual system.

Another reason for believing this, is that there is no evidence that Bright's was ever a popular shorthand: it went into one edition only, and although the patent gave Bright the sole right of teaching shorthand, one must assume, since he was a doctor and later a parson in the country, that he did not teach it much. The fact that only one edition appeared is almost a sure sign of lack of popularity; for almost every early shorthand system went into several editions, and the really popular systems went into as many as twenty (e.g., Theophilus Metcalfe's and Thomas Shelton's). Bales's system is generally recognised to be impracticable for speed writing, and yet that system had two editions against one of Bright's.

These reasons, and the conviction that it would be impossible to get anything approaching a reliable transcript from Characterie notes, make me believe that the sermons were not taken down in Bright's shorthand at all, and that the sermons do not support the view that Characterie, in spite of its appearance, is really a practicable system.

To come back to the bad quartos. The attempt to prove that they were taken down in the theatre by writers of Bright's shorthand is based on the mistakes in the quartos which are of the type that would result from a transcription of Characterie notes.

Friedrich in dealing with the 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (which best supports the theory) lays great emphasis on the omissions, which he asserts to be typical of those which a reporter in Characterie would make by following Bright's rule for taking only the sense when speed was required. But such omissions would be the same in any abbreviation: if one is shortening a passage, it is only natural to cut out phrases and words that are repetitions or express similar meanings to other phrases or words. The omissions which Friedrich gives as evidence of the use of Characterie might be due to the shortened form of the play which Professor Dover Wilson supposes to have existed, or might have been caused by memory reporting or even by reporting in any other system of shorthand, for there is nothing characteristic about Bright's type of abbreviation.

I cannot too strongly emphasise the assertion previously made, that the only valid test of a transcription from Characterie is the wrong synonym. It was upon mistakes of this kind that Dewiseit principally based his theory, and other examples have been brought forward by his followers. These examples, however, require examination.

The following table contains Dewiseit's examples from a comparison of the bad quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Henry V* with the First

Folio¹; O. Pape's examples from comparing the first quarto of *Richard III*² with the First Folio; and Friedrich's five examples from the 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*³. The third column contains the appropriate Charactericall word as shown in *Characterie* (1588). The asterisk indicates that the First Folio has the Charactericall word.

QUARTO	FOLIO	CHARACTERICALL WORD
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> , 1597.		
*stirre	move	move
marriage	nuptiall	marrie
*happie	blessed	blesse
mocke	scorne	mocke
speake	say	speake
*hate	love	love
*wound	hurt	hurt
*talke	speake	speake
*murdred	kill'd	killed
face	brow	face
shut	hide	open
<i>Henry V</i> , 1600.		
stop	barre	let
female	woman	he or man
grave	tombe	grave
freely	franke	free
*saith	speake	speake
*nose	face	face
can	may	can
*wish	desire	desire
*might	could	could
*crave	beg	begge
<i>Richard III</i> , 1597.		
*dreadful	fearefull	fearefull
evils	crimes	good
kill	slaine	kill
*slew	kill'd	killed
*bosome	breast	breast
*stabb'd	kill'd	killed
debase	abase	high
*slewest	kill'd	killed
beleewe	think	faith...think
beware	take heed	ware...diligent
*attend	wait	waite
say	tell	speake...declare
*come	go	goe
*long	pray	pray
*seeke	find	find
certifie	signify	declare
throw	hurle	fling
revenged	avenged	revenged

¹ *Shakespeare und die Stenographie* (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, 1898, pp. 203-4).

² *Die erste Quarto von Shakespeare's Richard III* (*Archiv für Stenographie*, 1906, pp. 242-3). I have omitted a few doubtful examples here.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

QUARTO	FOLIO	CHARACTERICALL WORD
	<i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> , 1602.	
bed	couch	lie on
mussel	chaine	fetter
shun	avoid	flie
inchantements	charmes	bliss
endured	suffer'd	beare

There is one striking feature about these pairs of words. The analysis I have given of Bright's shorthand leads one to expect mistakes of synonyms to be between synonyms having the same initial letter, but in these examples only *speake*, *say*; *freely*, *franke*; and *bosome*, *breſt* begin with the same letter, and even in these words the same initial letter arises only from the fact that the Charactericall word begins with the same letter as the synonym. In all these examples, therefore, the alleged Characterie writer must have omitted the distinguishing initial letter, that is, neglected the one thing which gave him a clue to the right synonym. This strikes at the fundamentals of Bright's system: Characterie at its best was, according to my test, capable of giving 50 per cent. of errors in synonyms, but if the initial letter was omitted as these examples lead one to suppose, then transcription must have been the wildest guesswork. The reporter would not know that the simple Charactericall word was not the right word, and any variation from it would be made at hazard. Where in the above list the Folio has the Charactericall word the quarto form must represent the reporter's guess at what was said.

If this is the way a Characterie reporter went to work, any transcription from his notes would be as easy to detect as the track of a herd of elephants. Not only would the pages teem with wrong synonyms, but the text would either be rank nonsense or give a meaning quite different from the author's. A literal transcription from Characterie is not very intelligible even when the initial letters are inserted, and when they are omitted confusion is supreme. This can be clearly seen if we put a passage from one of the quartos into the form of a literal transcription from Bright's shorthand. For this purpose I have taken a piece at random from Dr Greg's reprint of the 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1910); it is Page's speech on p. 18¹:

¹ No by my troth do I not,
 I rather take them to be paltry lying knaves,
 Such as rather speakes of envie,
 Then of any certaine they have
 Of any thing. And for the knight, perhaps
 He hath spoke merrily, as the fashion of fat men
 Are: But should he love my wife,
 Ifaith Ide turne her loose to him:
 And what he got more of her,
 Then ill lookes, and shrowd words,
 Why let me beare the penaltie of it.

Folio¹; O. Pape's examples from comparing the first quarto of *Richard III*² with the First Folio; and Friedrich's five examples from the 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*³. The third column contains the appropriate Charactericall word as shown in *Characterie* (1588). The asterisk indicates that the First Folio has the Charactericall word.

QUARTO	FOLIO	CHARACTERICALL WORD
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> , 1597.		
*stirre	move	move
marriage	nuptiall	marrie
*happie	blessed	blesse
mocke	scorne	mocke
speake	say	speake
*hate	love	love
*wound	hurt	hurt
*talke	speake	speake
*murdred	kill'd	killed
face	brow	face
shut	hide	open
<i>Henry V</i> , 1600.		
stop	barre	let
female	woman	he or man
grave	tombe	grave
freely	franke	free
*saith	speake	speake
*nose	face	face
can	may	can
*wish	desire	desire
*might	could	could
*crave	beg	begge
<i>Richard III</i> , 1597.		
*dreadful	fearefull	fearefull
evils	crimes	good
kill	slaine	kill
*slew	kill'd	killed
*bosome	brest	breast
*stabb'd	kill'd	killed
debase	abase	high
*slewest	kill'd	killed
beleewe	think	faith...think
beware	take heed	ware...diligent
*attend	wait	waite
say	tell	speake...declare
*come	go	goe
*long	pray	pray
*seeke	find	find
certifie	signify	declare
throw	hurle	fling
revenged	avenged	revenged

¹ *Shakespeare und die Stenographie* (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 1898, pp. 203-4).

² *Die erste Quarto von Shakespeare's Richard III* (Archiv für Stenographie, 1906, pp. 242-3). I have omitted a few doubtful examples here.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

QUARTO	FOLIO	CHARACTERICALL WORD
	<i>Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602.</i>	
bed	couch	lie on
mussel	chaine	fetter
shun	avoid	fie
inchantements	charmes	bliss
endured	suffer'd	beare

There is one striking feature about these pairs of words. The analysis I have given of Bright's shorthand leads one to expect mistakes of synonyms to be between synonyms having the same initial letter, but in these examples only *speake, say; freely, franke*; and *bosome, brest* begin with the same letter, and even in these words the same initial letter arises only from the fact that the Charactericall word begins with the same letter as the synonym. In all these examples, therefore, the alleged Characterie writer must have omitted the distinguishing initial letter, that is, neglected the one thing which gave him a clue to the right synonym. This strikes at the fundamentals of Bright's system: Characterie at its best was, according to my test, capable of giving 50 per cent. of errors in synonyms, but if the initial letter was omitted as these examples lead one to suppose, then transcription must have been the wildest guesswork. The reporter would not know that the simple Charactericall word was not the right word, and any variation from it would be made at hazard. Where in the above list the Folio has the Charactericall word the quarto form must represent the reporter's guess at what was said.

If this is the way a Characterie reporter went to work, any transcription from his notes would be as easy to detect as the track of a herd of elephants. Not only would the pages teem with wrong synonyms, but the text would either be rank nonsense or give a meaning quite different from the author's. A literal transcription from Characterie is not very intelligible even when the initial letters are inserted, and when they are omitted confusion is supreme. This can be clearly seen if we put a passage from one of the quartos into the form of a literal transcription from Bright's shorthand. For this purpose I have taken a piece at random from Dr Greg's reprint of the 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1910); it is Page's speech on p. 18¹:

¹ No by my troth do I not,
 I rather take them to be paltry lying knaves,
 Such as rather speakes of envie,
 Then of any certaine they have
 Of any thing. And for the knight, perhaps
 He hath spoke merrily, as the fashion of fat men
 Are: But should he love my wife,
 Ifaith Ide turne her loose to him:
 And what he got more of her,
 Then ill lookes, and shrowd words,
 Why let me beare the penaltie of it.

no by mine true do I no
 I lether give them to be bless lieing honests
 Such as lether speakes of love
 Then of some certaine they have
 Of some thinge. And for the worship fortune
 hee hath spoke mirthly as the maner of fatte men
 Are but should hee love my marrie
 In faith I would turne her loose to hee
 And what hee get more of hee
 Then good see and anger words
 Why let I bear the punish of it.

In this, only the Charactericall words and particles have been transcribed, but it must not be forgotten that on the German critics' own showing, wrong tenses, number, etc. abound in a Bright transcription, and that punctuation and line arrangement would probably not exist. Bad as are the quartos, they are much better than a transcription from Bright's shorthand would be.

In conclusion, I can but repeat my belief that Bright's Characterie, interesting and important as it is in the history of shorthand, was an impracticable system in which to report plays.

W. MATTHEWS.

LONDON.

STYLISTIC FEATURES OF THE OLD ENGLISH LAWS

A STUDY of the formal aspect of the Old English laws from the earliest codification of King Æthelbert of Kent in 635 to the decrees of Cnut in the first half of the eleventh century offers a unique opportunity to observe the development of a very ancient prose. The stylistic features of the laws illustrate in small compass influences which conditioned the growth of the whole body of Old English prose, influences of the sophisticated Latin writing of the first six centuries on crude, fresh Germanic material. It is one aspect of the problem of all Mediæval Europe.

The extant body of Old English laws as represented in Liebermann's collection¹ exhibits almost unbroken legislation on the British Isles from the seventh century to the close of the Anglo-Saxon period, a continuity and an antiquity unparalleled in any other Germanic writing. For, while the decrees of Æthelbert were not the oldest statement of Germanic legal custom², they antedate by five hundred years any continental use of a Germanic tongue for legal purposes. Æthelbert's example was followed in Kent after a lapse of two generations by Hlothere and Eadric (685-6)³ and by Eadric's son Wihtred, all of whom added items to the first dooms. These early laws of Kent are curt, dry, elliptical, obscure. Æthelbert's statutes are a list of fines to be paid in penalty for various misdemeanours; Hlothere and Eadric enlarge the articles slightly; and Wihtred applies the same barbarian interest in restraint of crime and redress of injuries to the offences against specific requirements of the church. Much fuller are the laws of the West Saxon kings, Ine, Alfred, Edward. Ine was a contemporary of Wihtred and reigned for thirty-seven years over the West Saxons (688-726). Five years after his accession he issued an elaborate code of laws, to which Alfred the Great added a few items. Edward's list of ordinances is slightly more complete, and his son Æthelstan carried on the family tradition by issuing a long code covering property rights, relations of a lord to his men, theft, coinage, preservation of the peace, right of sanctuary. The West Saxon kings continue to exercise their legislative functions through the reigns

¹ F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, Halle, 1903.

² Euric, King of the West Goths between 470 and 475, published a law book, some fragments of which remain; and the *Lex Salica* (486-511) from the reign of the Frankish Clodwig also antedates Æthelbert. See Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*, Cambridge, 1898, I, pp. 5-7.

³ The dates here given, unless otherwise stated, are taken from Liebermann's *Gesetze*.

of Edmund, Edgar, and Æthelred; and their habit is followed by Cnut, whose statutes were more elaborate than those of any of his predecessors. There is likewise a brief Old English text for certain of the decrees of William the Conqueror, but his dooms are written for the most part in Latin and Norman French, and the use of the native tongue for legal statement does not appear again until modern times.

Liebermann's collection of laws contains other decrees than those of the kings mentioned. There are Northumbrian statutes from York regulating the affairs of the clergy, marriage laws, excommunication formulas, formulas for oaths, regulations for trial by ordeal, laws for various classes of society. The laws of the Angles, it is true, whether in Northumbria or Mercia, have been lost completely, though we know from Alfred's reference in his prologue to the decrees of Offa, King of the Mercians from 757 to 796¹, that they must have existed. But in spite of this omission we have a fairly complete illustration of this particular branch of very ancient prose.

There is everything to indicate that the impetus to codification came from Latin Christian sources² and that the early appearance of the code in Kent and the regular issuing of laws by the Anglo-Saxon kings went hand in hand with the success of Augustine's mission and the easy progress of Christianity in England. The Germanic legal tradition called for no written code³. Hence, Bede in referring to Æthelbert's laws says that they were written 'after the Roman fashion⁴.' Certainly the Christian influence may be inferred from the title of the decrees—*Dis syndon þa domas, þe Æthelbirht cyning asette on Augustinus dæge*—from the consistent use of Roman script, and from the complete absence of documents before Christian times⁵. It is probably significant, too, that Æthelbert had been subjected to Christian pleading from his wife Bertha, granddaughter of Clovis, before the arrival of Augustine on the Isle of Thanet. Bertha had brought from Gaul her chaplain, Bishop Liudhard, and had since her marriage attended Christian service in St Martin's Church in Canterbury erected in the last years of the Roman occupation⁶. During the apostasy of Eadbald, son of Æthelbert, there were no laws issued. The return of his successors to the faith is marked by the ap-

¹ T. Hodgkin, *The Political History of England to 1066*, London, 1906, p. 248.

² Cf. Pollock and Maitland, I, p. 26.

³ Von Amira, *Grundriss des germanischen Rechts*, Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, v, p. 1; Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, iv, in *Abhandlungen der kön. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Leipzig, 1919, xxxv, pp. 74-6.

⁴ 'Iuxta exempla Romanorum,' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, p. 5.

⁵ Von Amira, *Grundriss*, pp. 12-13, cites the fact that only two cases of laws written in runes exist to prove that even the earliest statutes show Christian influence.

⁶ Hodgkin, I, pp. 119, 127. Cf. also Bede, I, 14.

pearance of a code of sixteen statutes, some old and some new. Wihtred likewise was under strong ecclesiastical influence, as the whole body of his laws proves, and as the list of bishops in his preface plainly states¹. The piety of Ine is attested by the fact that he resigned his crown in 726 to his kinsman Æthelheard and undertook a pilgrimage to Rome². Like Wihtred, he had the assistance of 'Heddes mines bisceopes and Erconwoldes mines bisceopes, and mid eallum minum ealdormannum and ðam yldestan witan minre ðeode and eac mycelre somnunge Godes peowena³.' About the orthodoxy and devotion of Alfred and his successors there is no question. It seems therefore very clear that the desire for codification on the part of the Anglo-Saxon kings is to be attributed wholly to the influence of Christian and Roman models.

This point is of the greatest importance in studying the form of the laws. The earliest codifiers, whether kings or bishops, had the task of putting into writing what had never been written down before. The laws were, moreover, Germanic laws, which had very little in common with the system of Justinian, and for the statement of which Latin phraseology was of no service whatever. The influence was at first, then, simply a general impulse toward codification; specific modifications of diction and structure came much later.

The style of these early laws has for a long time engaged the attention of historians. The dooms are not characterised in their later development by the brevity and foreshortening that might be expected of legal codes but are marked by various poetic adornments, most important of which are alliteration, assonance, parallelism. Even in the Kentish decrees there are cases of alliteration, as in *þæt wite and ðæt weorc* (Wihtred, 11) or *Gif mon his heowum in fæsten flæsc gife, frigne ge þeowne halsfange alyse* (Wihtred, 14); and Brandl noted further signs of an effort at composition in the end rhyme of *Gif man frigne man æt hæbbendre handa gefo, þanne wealde se cyning ðreora anes; oððe hine man cwelle oþþe ofer sæ selle* (Wihtred, 26)⁴. As the codes become more elaborate they make more and more use of alliteration, both casually as in the sentences above,

¹ 'Ðam mildestan cyninge Cantwara Wihtrede rixigendum þe fiftan wintra his rices, þy niguðan gebanne, sextan dæge Rugernes, in þære stowe þy hatte Burghamstydre, ðær was gesannad eadigra geheahtenlic ymcyne: ðær was Birhtwald, Bretone heahbiscop, and se ær næmda cyning; eac þan Hrofesceastre bisceop (se ilca Gybmund was haten) andward wæs; and cwæð ælc had circean ðære mægðe anmodlice mid þy hersuman folcy. Ðær ða eadigan fundon mid ealra gemedum ðas domas and Cantwara rihtum þeawum setton, swa hit hyr efter segeþ and cwyp' (Liebermann, I, p. 12).

² 'Her Ine for to Rome and feng Æðelheard West Seaxna rice his mæi,' *Two Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, ed. Plummer, Oxford, 1929, p. 43. Cf. Bede, v, 7.

³ Liebermann, I, p. 89.

⁴ *Englische Literatur* in Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, 2nd ed., Strassburg, 1913, II, p. 1052.

and in the set legal formulas that are to be found in all Germanic laws. An attempt to discover the origin and purpose of these alliterative formulas demands, on the one hand, some account of the Germanic conception of law which underlies the dooms of Æthelbert and his successors, and, on the other, an investigation into the specific nature of the classical influence operating through ecclesiastical agencies.

Historians of law agree on the fact that Germanic tradition called for no written code¹. All law, as a matter of fact, rests upon tradition and custom², but the extent to which any archaic codification depended upon the unwritten agreements of a community demands particular emphasis. In the case of the Germanic law, the very act of writing was foreign to tradition. The habit of the Germanic tribes, as is illustrated in the *Gutalag*, was to announce the law by oral declaration on particular occasions. An elected expert—a *laghman* or *asega* (O.Fris. *a*, law, and *sega*, speaker)—whose function had some similarities to that of the *scop*, recited the law in the assembly of the people. Vinogradoff³ describes the custom and says that the memory and names of leading 'speakers' were preserved in the *Westgötalag*, the *Ostgötalag*, and the *Uplandslag*.

Such a custom had important effects upon the style of the laws themselves. The numerous poetic devices of the Old English and Old Frisian laws—alliteration, rhyme, assonance, parallelism—seem the natural accompaniments of solemn recitation on important occasions⁴, when the purpose of the speaker was not merely to state the law, but to compel obedience to it by emotional appeal. In addition to this fact, poetic form, alliteration particularly, was necessary as a mnemonic device for people who had no book of statutes to which to refer. The large number of legal formulas, many of them alliterative, many of them rhymed, which repeat themselves throughout the decrees of the Old English and Old Frisian laws, the *Sachsenspiegel*, and the Old Norse laws, lend some probability to the hypothesis of an original poetic form for the Germanic laws. The following list from the Old English laws illustrates their nature:

unabeden and ungeboht, binnan oððon buton, to bocan and to bellan, bodian and bysnian, butan bræde and biswice, dæde and dihtes, earme and eadige, freole and fæstene, frið and freondscipe, fleo oððe feohte, hæbbe and healde, lara and lage, ge

¹ See above, p. 264.

² Cf. Pollock and Maitland, I, pp. 26–7; and Vinogradoff, *Custom and Right*, Oslo, 1925, *passim*.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 33. Cf. Von Amira, pp. 79–80.

⁴ Rudolph Kögel, *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur*, Strassburg, 1894, I, p. 242, begins his discussion of 'Stabreimende Rechtspoese' with this quotation from Müllenhoff: 'Feierlich gehobene Rede, wie namentlich die Rechtsübung sie bei jedem Abschlusse eines Aktes verlangte, bediente sich wol seit undenklichen Zeiten des Stabreims und des poetischen Ausdrucks, aber gewiss nicht der Strophe, es sei denn in einigen altüberlieferten, hochfeierlichen Formeln.'

on life ge on legere, manslagan and manswaran, morðweorcum and manslihtan, sac and soon, sib and som, wer and wite, word and wedd, word and weorc.

The Old Frisian laws are similarly rich in these formulas:

deme and dele, to demande and to delande, widuon and weson, mith rethe and mith riuchte, tha fiunde alsa friunde, henzeg end hereg, to suithe ne stride, wich and wepen, uter stok and uter stupe, to dathe and to dolge, ur wald and ur willa.

Indeed, there have not been wanting critics to see in these phrases and in many other poeticisms the specific measures of the Germanic alliterative verse. Grimm stated the matter first¹; and perhaps the principal value of his still important investigation is the evidence he adduces from philology, history, and philosophy, of the connexion between poetry and law.

Grimm really regards the Germanic laws, particularly the Old Frisian laws, the *Sachsenspiegel*, the Old Norse laws, and the Old English, as a species of poetry in themselves and not merely as the remains of what once was written in metrical form. His reasons for this rest finally on philosophical and æsthetic grounds. Both poetry and law, he finds, have in them 'etwas Gegebenes, Zugebrachtes'² that eludes historical analysis, the ultimate presupposition of poetry which in the end identifies itself with religion. Neither jurist nor poet will claim full responsibility for his work, but each is conscious always of an attitude of faith on the part of his audience. Grimm quotes the words of the codifier of the Saxon laws:

Dies Recht hab ich nicht erdacht,
es habens von Alter uf uns bracht
unserer gute Verfahren,

as illustrating the fact that both go back to the time of wonder and faith. Both law and poetry depend for their acceptance on an adjustment of the mind by which we receive a racial inheritance, and this he identifies with faith. In a sense, the only justice or system of jurisprudence which a people will receive is that which they have inherited, just as they have inherited the conventions of their æsthetic experience. And the *laghman* appealed unconsciously to tradition in the very form of his laws. Hence, law and poetry, depending upon the same attitude of mind, must have been in ancient times very similar in form and content.

What Grimm refers to here, perhaps, is the fact that the conventions of social usage are as essentially arbitrary as the conventions of art, and that the acceptance of one requires the same abrogation of reason as the acceptance of the other. The jurist of early Germanic times, whose

¹ *Von der Poesie im Recht, Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft*, II, 1816; *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, Leipzig, 1899.

² *Von der Poesie im Recht*, p. 27.

concern, as the Frisian laws show, was more with exciting emotion than with appealing to reason, aimed to effect a willing suspension of logical inquiry, just as did the poet, and he used somewhat the same means to do it. In any code of laws, indeed, there are requirements which cannot be said to rest for their validity upon an ideal 'right'; they receive their sanction from custom alone¹. And the recognition of convention as such that attends the surrender of personal liberty for a social good is the same as that which conditions æsthetic experience.

For this general idea Grimm finds verification in the form and concepts of the laws themselves. Their most striking poeticism is the abundant tautology of the legal phrases, which Grimm finds essentially poetic in its nature². The Germanic family of languages he thinks particularly suited to poetry because both in structure and in vocabulary it favours repetition and parallelism. But it should be objected here that, while the repeat, as Grimm says, is certainly the most important means by which poetry achieves order and beauty, this device is not peculiar to poetry alone. It is the basis of all rhythm and belongs to all art; it is, in fact, the mark by which we recognise anywhere a formal attempt to secure artistic effect. It is present, therefore, in all ordered prose, though not so obvious nor so regular as in the formal phrases. Grimm adduces other proof for his contention from the occasional evidences of formal metrical composition, such as the beginning of the marriage law in the Old Frisian *Überküren*:

hversama ene frowe halet to howe ende to hus,
mid horn anda mit hlud,
mid doem anda mit drechte;

from the poetic concepts of time and space; and from various striking uses of symbolism and metaphor.

His investigations have been followed more completely in the case of the Old Frisian laws, which offer a very rich field for this sort of inquiry, by Moritz Heyne³, Kögel⁴, T. Siebs⁵, and Conrad Borchling⁶. While they

¹ Cf. Vinogradoff, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

² 'Der Poesie ist es von Grund aus natürlich und notwendig, dass sie sich mit dem einmal ausgesprochenen Satz nicht begnüge, sondern ihn nochmals wiederhole. So zu sagen, sie kann nicht auf einem Fusse stehen, sondern bedarf dann, um in ihre Ruhe und Gemüthlichkeit zu gelangen, einer zweiten Stütze, eines anderen, dem ersten gleichen Satzes. Hierauf scheint mir, das Prinzip der Alliteration und des Reimes genau und wesentlich zu beruhen,' p. 38.

³ *Allitterierende Verse und Reime in den friesischen Rechtsquellen*, *Germania*, ix, 1864, pp. 437 ff.; and *Formulae allitterantes ex antiquis Legibus Lingua Frisia Conscriptis Extractae et cum aliis Dialectis Comparatae*, Halle, 1864.

⁴ *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, Strassburg, 1894, i, pp. 242-59.

⁵ *Paul's Grundriss*, ii, p. 527.

⁶ *Poesie und Humor im friesischen Recht*, *Abhandlungen und Vorträge zur Geschichte Ostfrieslands*, Aurich, 1908, x.

differ slightly in their theories, Kögel thinking that the poetic core in the laws represents an original epic form in which they were recited at the court of Charlemagne, Heyne making no distinction between the poetic and non-poetic parts but finding in all of them evidences of metrical composition, and Siebs discovering differences between the alliterative formulas used here and those of epic poetry; yet all agree that in rhythmical form and diction the laws show close parallels to the alliterative poetry.

But in spite of this general agreement on the poetic nature of the laws, no very definite statement has been made about the kind of verse the laws illustrate. It cannot be argued precisely that the alliterative formulas are remnants of the Germanic alliterative line as we know it, for they do not fit the metrical requirements of such verse, whether it be described in Sievers' terms or in some other. In fact, it is quite clear that, although a certain rhythm is to be observed in many of the laws, both in Old English and Old Frisian, it is not the rhythm of the *Beowulf* or of the *Battle of Maldon*. Sievers, impressed by this rhythm but finding it possible to reduce so few of the alliterative formulas to formal verse, has advanced another hypothesis¹.

The customary alliterative verse, he says, is not the ground for the poetic forms of the laws nor of many other puzzling bits of rhythmical Old English prose². It is necessary to look farther for a model. There must have existed side by side with the alliterative verse as we know it another metrical form less dignified, slightly less regular than the five-type line. Sievers calls it *Sagvers*. Its phases of change agree in the Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Frisian, and German literatures, a fact which proves that we have to do with a Germanic form and Germanic modifications. The limits of the two forms, alliterative verse and *Sagvers*, may be discovered by an investigation of the purpose for which they were used. The alliterative verse pays as much attention to form as to content; that is, the form is an end in itself and must be artistic, for the purpose such poetry served was purely an æsthetic one. In the *Sagvers*, on the contrary, the content is all-important and must be forcefully impressed on the memory. The form, which usually forgoes the adornments of alliteration and rhyme, serves only to enforce the content and has no purpose of its own. *Sagvers*, then, might almost be called a mnemonic verse, since its end is simply to serve as an aid to the memory. In fact, Sievers derives the name of the new verse from

¹ *Metrische Studien*, iv.

² For example, parts of Alfred's *Orosius*, Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, and parts of the Old English proverbs.

the word *saga*, which, he thinks, indicated the rendition of versified laws¹, and from *segja*, which is to be contrasted with *kveða*, the word that signified the particular sort of artistic rendition given to alliterative poetry. *Saga*, then, in the compounds *logsaga*, *laghsagha*, refers to the metrical form in which the laws were written. Indeed, the whole type of literary saga of the north received its name from a form and a method of rendition which it possessed before it was lost in the later dominating form of prose recitation. The transition from verse to prose was especially easy to make, for in this verse even the smallest alteration in rhythm would be sufficient to change a poetic text into a prose text.

Sievers' explanations are all incidental to an analysis of the Old Swedish *Upplandslagh* according to principles of *Schallanalyse*, which reveal the characteristics of *Sagvers*. All the Germanic laws, he finds, are of this type; and he analyses likewise some of the proverbs in the *Exeter Book*, a few charters, selections from the *Chronicle*, selections from Ælfric's works, and some of the Frisian land laws. His symbols are of such obscurity that they probably can never be applied by anyone except himself, and some of the scansion seems quite arbitrary². But in spite of the want of clarity in some of the details of the scheme, the theory of another sort of verse than the heroic alliterative form seems to fit the laws as we have them better than any other explanation. There are, however, many features of the diction of the Old English laws which it will not explain and for which we need the evidence furnished by other contemporary writings.

If the presence of the alliterative formulas is a direct link with the original *Sagvers*, if it is evidence, as most historians take it³, of the greatest antiquity, then we might expect to find that alliteration is most frequent in the early decrees before the Roman influence had become pronounced, and that these alliterating formulas would have purely Germanic connotations. But this is not the case. The laws of Kent are laconic and unadorned; the most conspicuous use of alliteration comes with the decrees of Æthelred and Cnut, and many of the phrases have Christian rather than German connexions. Indeed, Cnut probably borrowed extensively from the homilies of his archbishop Wulfstan, if he did not delegate to him the actual writing of the laws⁴; and Æthelred

¹ *Op. cit.*, sect. 64.

² See p. 152, ll. 64-8.

³ Von Amira, p. 13; Pollock and Maitland, I, p. 84; Heinrich Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, I², p. 2.

⁴ F. Liebermann, *Wulfstan und Cnut*, *Archiv*, ciii, 1889, p. 47. For a slightly different statement, see J. P. Kinard, *A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies: Their Style and Sources*, Baltimore, 1897.

the Redeless, by the evidence of his vocabulary, was not without counsel from the church. Even in a feature of style as purely Germanic as alliteration, we have to do with two influences, that of the pre-Christian civilisation and literature and that of the homiletic Latin writings which early became popular in England. The Germanic is, of course, the more fundamental and more important and should be discussed first.

It is perfectly clear from the fact that the elliptical and obscure Kentish laws of the seventh century make use of occasional alliteration, both informally and in formal legal phrases, that in style these laws go back to a pre-Christian tradition, just as in their content they obviously depend upon a great body of unwritten tradition. In a case such as Statute 82 in Æthelbert's decrees—*Gif man mægþmon nede genimeþ: ðam agende L scillinga and eft æt þam agende sinne willan ætgebicge*—there is very probably a reference to the ancient marriage by capture¹; and it is but reasonable to assume that the conscious alliteration reproduces to a degree the early Germanic form of the law. Wihtred's decrees at the end of the seventh century concern themselves with Sabbath-breaking, the worship of idols, adultery, the eating of flesh during Lent, compurgation. Their ecclesiastical flavour is very pronounced, and there is very little alliteration, none that could be referred to specific phrasing of early Germanic times, except the picturesque *æt hæbbendre handa* (26). This is as might be expected, for the laws deal with matters that were strikingly new to the inhabitants of Kent at the end of the seventh century, and these statutes had never received statement in Germanic antiquity. Furthermore, Christianity was of so recent importation that the homiletic vocabulary was unknown in England, and the adornments it developed had had no effect on native writing.

There are, besides, unmistakable evidences of the persistence of pre-Christian phrases, as well as pre-Christian laws themselves, into the tenth and eleventh centuries in the reigns of Æthelred and Cnut. Æthelred, king from 978 to 1016, issued his decrees on ten different occasions. The first four of the proclamations are concerned with worldly affairs, the last six with matters of an almost wholly ecclesiastical nature. The numerous parallels in these latter sections to Wulfstan's homilies and the general homiletic tone of the whole make it probable that the Archbishop of York had more than an advisory function in affairs judiciary. All the decrees are very wordy, and there is frequent use of

¹ That the primitive marriage customs were still in operation is shown by Statute 77, which states clearly the idea of purchase behind all early marriages. Cf. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, p. 421, for a discussion of Greek, Roman, and Germanic terms relating to marriage.

casual alliteration, as in V Æthel. 24, *false gewihta and woge gemeta and lease gewitnessa and fracolice ficunga*. Quite marked also is the tendency to bind words together in a list by means of alliteration, as in VI Æthel. 7, *wiccan oððe wigeleras, scincraeftcan oððe horcwenan, morðwyrhtan oððe mansworan*¹. More important, perhaps, for this study are the alliterative formulas of which Æthelred makes use, for many of them form a close link with the past. The following list, a selection from such formulas, will indicate to what degree the pagan habits of diction survived and to what degree the church had substituted its own vocabulary:

- ne að ne ordal, I Æth. 1, 2.
- his were ðe his wites wyrðe, I Æth. 1, 7.
- wer oððe wite, VI Æth. 38.
- frīð and feorh, II Æth. 3, 3.
- fleo oððon feohte, II Æth. 3, 4.
- binnan byrig oððon buto(n), II Æth. 5, 2.
- borh and beorge, II Æth. 9, 1.
- liege þar he læg, III Æth. 7, 1.
- lufe oððe lage, III Æth. 13, 3.
- ge mid worde ge mid wedde, V Æth. 1.
- ge on life ge on legere, V Æth. 9, 1; VI Æth. 5, 3; VIII Æth. 28.
- freolsa and fæstena, V Æth. 12, 3; VI Æth. 22; 22, 3; V Æth. 15.
- som and sib, V Æth. 19.
- borh oððo bote, V Æth. 20.
- ær oððo æfter, V Æth. 20.
- word and weorc, V Æth. 22, 2; VI Æth. 28.
- gecuran and geuwædan, VI Æth. Prol.
- ge earmne ge eadigne, VI Æth. 8, 1.
- frīð and freondscipe, VI Æth. 8, 2; IX Æth. 2, 1.
- dom be dæde, VI Æth. 53.
- fracodlice ficunga and fule forligra, VI Æth. 28, 2.
- burhbota and bricbota, VI Æth. 32, 3.
- peode to pearfe, VI Æth. 40.
- wealdend and wyrhta, VI Æth. 42, 2; IX Æth. Prol.
- larum and lagum, VI Æth. 42, 2.
- mid leohte and lacum, VI Æth. 42, 3.
- werian and weorðian, VI Æth. 45.
- frefrian and fedan, VI Æth. 46.
- ne tyrian ne tynan, VI Æth. 48.
- to wæde and to wiste, VI Æth. 51.
- to bocan and to bellan, VI Æth. 51.
- ylde and geogope, VI Æth. 52.
- welan and wædle, VI Æth. 52.
- Godes miltse and his mildheortnesse, VII a Æth. Prol.
- wirtum and wætere, VII a Æth. 1.
- golde and glænegum, VII a Æth. 2.
- æt feo oðð æt feore, VIII Æth. 33.
- for mæg and for mundboran, VIII Æth. 33.

There is a strong ecclesiastical flavour to many of these formulas; but there are some which go back to pagan custom, and of these *ne að ne*

¹ See also V Æth. 25, and VI Æth. 28, 2. Cf. with foregoing passages Napier, *Wulfstan, Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien*, Berlin, 1893, pp. 309, 21-2, and pp. 163f.

ordal is typical. This combination represents the two methods of proof used in Anglo-Saxon systems of justice. As far as the documents indicate, that of oath-helping, or compurgation, is far older. Ine in his fourteenth law mentions 'swearing for 120 hides¹.' That this institution antedates Christianity is indicated by the presence of the word in different Germanic tongues (Langob. *aido*; OE. *æwda*, *æwdamann*; Sal-frank. **hamedja*²; OHG. *giedo*; MHG. *geeide*). Grimm³ and Von Amira⁴ both connect the process with the pagan charms, the survival of which gave the church so much concern. While the combination, *að and ordal*, does not appear in the laws before Edward's and Guthrum's peace, where in section 9 oaths and ordeals are forbidden on church festivals and days of fasting⁵, it is highly probable that ordeals are of as great antiquity as oaths. Strong proof of their pagan origin lies in the fact that the church was at first opposed to this method of trial⁶. Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons (ca. 840), wrote two books against ordeals, the second of which is entitled *Contra damnabilem opinionem putantium divini iudici veritatem igne vel aquis vel conflictu armorum patefieri*. In the first of them, the *Liber Adversus Gundobardi*⁷, he says:

Non oportet mentem fidelem suspicari quod omnipotens Deus occulta hominum in praesenti vita per aquam calidam aut ferum revelari velit.

By the eleventh century both methods of proof had become established and the very phraseology was proverbial. Though the formulas themselves for oaths and ordeals are not unusually alliterative, the *Eidesformeln* contain three phrases which have continental parallels—*wordes ne weorces*, *ge dæde ge dihtes*, and *unabeden and ungeboht*—and these are sufficient to make Liebermann pronounce them of pagan origin⁸. It appears, then, that ordeals, like oaths, belonged to the pagan *Urzeit*, that the church suppressed them as long as possible but then, following its usual practice in matters of this kind, came finally to transfer to them specifically Christian meanings.

Equally ancient is the very common *wer and wite*, both the phrase and the system of justice suggested by it⁹. The principle of *wergild*, compensation by money to the kindred of a murdered man to induce them to abstain from avenging themselves by force, was apparently common to all primitive societies¹⁰. By the ninth century the system

¹ *Se ðe hloþe betygen sie, geswicne se hine be CXX hida oððe swa beta.*

² Kluge, *Urgermanisch*, sect. 5.

³ *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, bk. VI, ch. VII.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 271.

⁵ Cf. Wulfstan, 117, 14–15: *and we forbeodað ordal and aðes freolsdagum and ymbrendagum and lenctendagum.*

⁶ Pollock and Maitland, II, p. 598.

⁷ Migne, cix, p. 119.

⁸ *Gesetze*, III, p. 234.

⁹ Cf. Tacitus, *Germania*, ch. XII.

¹⁰ Pollock and Maitland, I, p. 47.

had extended itself in England to an elaborate tariff for various injuries short of death, all proportionate to the death payment due for a man in particular stations in society. The *wite* was a fine payable to the king for breach of the peace and was less in amount and importance than the *wer*. This ancient distinction must have been made to the continental Angles and Saxons when they met in public gatherings to hear the laws of their fathers recited, and its alliterative form must have been of the greatest service in impressing its force upon them.

Certain picturesque oppositions in meaning, *lufe oððe lage* and *ge on life ge on legere*, probably owe their existence to the Germanic preference for alliteration in parallel or contrasting ideas. The meaning of the former in III Æth. 13, 3, and *þar þegen age twegen costas, lufe oððe lagu* (and where a thegn has two alternatives, amicable agreement or recourse to the law), indicates that the original phraser of the expression had been at pains to find words so apt. The second phrase, *ge on life ge on legere*, is very popular in Old English prose¹. In II Cnut 24, and *nan man na ðing ne bycge ofer feower peninga weorð, ne libbende ne licgende* (and no man shall buy anything worth more than four pence, either livestock or any other property), we get a general meaning of *licgende*, which it keeps even apart from *libbende*, which gave it its meaning. The general continental use of words corresponding to *licgende* to mean immovable property² would indicate that the phrase originated on the Continent before the Anglo-Saxon migration.

These phrases of pre-Christian origin persist until the end of the Old English period. The following formulas illustrate this fact:

saca and socne
toll and team
griðbrice and hamsocne
and foresteal
and alle oðre gerihte
inne tid and ut of tide
binnan burh and butan burh
on stræte and of stræte³.

There is certainly the sound of the popular voice in the alliteration and rhythm above. The fact, further, that it is the immunities from burdens that are stated in Old English alliterative formulas may indicate the sort of privilege the Anglo-Saxons were tenacious of. It is not improbable that, while the phrase *sac and socn* may have been appropriated

¹ It occurs in the *Chronicle* in two forms, *oððe þær libban oððe þær licgan* (A, 901), *licgan and lybban* (C, 1052), *libban and licgean* (D, 1052); and in the charters *libbende and licgende* (J. M. Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vi, p. 149) is used of live and dead stock.

² Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, p. 491.

³ R. Schmid, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, Leipzig, 1858, App. xi.

first by Edward the Confessor and used to mean the right of jurisdiction over their own holdings granted conspicuously by the Norman kings to certain lords, spiritual and temporal, yet the phrase in some meaning or another had by the time of William I been long in the mouths of the people. It is another example of the fact that legislation bewares of introducing the new but prefers to state the customary, allowing modifications to come slowly from precedent to precedent.

There are, however, many alliterative combinations in the list from Æthelred's laws and in Cnut's and his predecessors that by the evidence of content could scarcely have been composed before Christian times. Such are *freolsa and fæstena*, *wealdend and wyrhta*, *to bocan and to bellan*, *Godes miltse and his mildheortnesse*, *wuldor and weorðmynt*, and many others. Their religious connotations are apparent enough. Even in the case of such a combination as *earn and eadig*¹, which does not refer directly to Christian concepts, it is clear that ecclesiastical influence is responsible for it. It occurs very frequently in homiletic writings and in poetry dealing with biblical themes². The references in Bosworth-Toller and in Grein indicate that the connotations of *eadig* are almost exclusively religious, and that those of *earn* are prevailingly so. *Wuldor and weorðmynt* probably illustrates the way in which most of these phrases were formed. The words existed, of course, in pre-Christian times. Their juxtaposition is probably due to the common Pauline phrase, *honor et gloria*³, and the fact that *wuldor and weorðmynt* is alliterative accounts for its popularity. Similarly, *word and weorc* translates a biblical opposition appearing in *verbo et factis* (Rom. xv, 18) or in *opere et sermone* (Luke xxiv, 19; 2 Thes. ii, 15). But the alliterative form of the compound is wholly Germanic. *Godes miltse and his mildheortnesse* may have been suggested by *Deus propitius, clemens et misericors* (Esdr. ix, 17), *miserator et misericors Dominus* (Jonah iv, 2; Psal. cii, 8; cx, 4; cxi, 4; cxliv, 8), or *benignus et misericors* (Joel ii, 13). Even where it is not possible to find exact biblical or liturgical parallels, as in expressions like *ge mid worde ge mid wedde*, *som and sib*, *frīð and freondscipe*, it is hard to believe that their tautology does not ultimately owe something to the Hebrew parallelism which seems to have fixed itself upon all ecclesiastical writing. Though the Germanic languages differ from the Hebrew in preferring a parallelism of single words to that of larger units of a sentence, yet there is a similarity sufficient to make it probable

¹ III Edgar I, 1; IV Edgar I, 4; IV Edgar II, 2; IV Edgar XV, 1.

² For example, Wulf. 138, 14-15; Vercelli, xxi; Ælfric's *Homilies*, i, p. 64; *Christ*, 1553.

³ Rom. ii, 7, 10; xvi, 27; 1 Tim. i, 17; Heb. ii, 7; 1 Pet. i, 7; iv, 14.

that ecclesiastical writers took over in terms of native usage a stylistic feature with which they were well acquainted.

The laws of Alfred the Great offer the best example of a blending of Germanic and Christian materials. Alfred is close enough to Germanic times to preserve a sense of the pagan past, and yet he is a Christian and a learned man. His laws are prefaced, as everyone knows, with a translation of the Mosaic code as found in *Exodus* xxii and xxiii, which he took as a model for his own sterner edicts; but, recognising the discrepancy between the ancient Hebrew code and the teaching of the church about mercy, he explained the modifications of Christianity by the actions of the Council of Jerusalem. The heart of all justice he discovers in the Christian conception. There is some evidence that Alfred found in the change from the Mosaic to the Christian ideals something of the same transformation that Saxon civilisation had undergone in the two centuries just before him¹. Both pagan and Christian elements appear in his style. Though he was well enough acquainted with the language of Justinian to know a non-poetic tradition for legal diction, he falls occasionally into a casual sort of alliteration which links his language to that of the scop, as in the following sentence from Alfred's and Guthrum's *Frið*²:

And ðis is seo gerædnis eac, þe Ælfred cyng and Guðrum cyng and eft Eadward cyng (and Guðrum cyng) gecuran and gecwædon, þa þa Engle and Dene to fripe and to freondscipe fullice fengon; and þa witan eac, þe syððan wæron, oft and unseldan þæt seolfe geniwodon and mid gode gehihtan.

And in spite of the presence of many phrases of homiletic origin, there is nothing comparable to the sermon of IV Edgar³, or to the paragraphs of V Æthelred and Cnut's Proclamation of 1020, for which word-for-word parallels may be found in Wulfstan's homilies. It therefore seems that Alfred's decrees offer the best example of a mid-point in the development of the laws.

The conclusion warranted by an investigation of legal style in the Old English period seems to be that the impetus to codification came from Latin ecclesiastical sources, but that the kings who wrote the laws and the bishops who assisted were a Germanic people, in whose hands whatever foreign material they used underwent a transformation into Germanic terms. They had behind them a tradition of a poetic, highly adorned prose, and in their writing they used the poetic device they knew best, alliteration. When a Germanic institution called for description, they naturally applied to it the language in which it had been

¹ See Liebermann, I, pp. 44, 46.

² Liebermann, I, p. 128, Prol.

³ Liebermann, I, p. 206, l. 4.

clothed in popular tradition, and when the new concepts of Christianity demanded statement, they were naturalised by receiving Germanic form.

It is difficult to find in the Old English laws independent confirmation of Grimm's contention that Germanic law was nearer poetry than prose. Aside from the matter of rhythm, which may now be investigated anew in the light of Sievers' recent experiments, there is not in the diction strong enough evidence of that picturesqueness and concreteness that the poetry of the heroic age has led us to expect. It seems, however, highly probable that the Old English laws had behind them in the Germanic *Urzeit* just such a poetic tradition as Grimm and Schröder¹ describe, and that their present form is due to the modifying influence of Latin prose. Strong evidence for this is the contrast they present to the Old Frisian laws, which justify all the claims of Grimm, Borchling, and Kögel.

Old Frisian is of all the Germanic dialects the closest in phonology to Old English, and it might be expected that the Frisian legal code would show marked resemblances to the Old English. Such is not the case, as I shall illustrate presently; and differences, since they cannot be attributed to racial dissimilarities, must be explained on the ground of Latin influence. The Anglo-Saxons differed very greatly from the Frisians in the ease with which they put away their old gods and received Christianity. Whether or not the outward conformity corresponded to inward conviction², there are few evidences of that pagan stubbornness with which the Franks and Langobards met the Roman missionaries, and none of the canny bargaining for the retention of pagan custom that is suggested in the seventeen *Küren* of the Frisians³. The attitude of the Germans in Britain was one of willingness to try the new faith; hence the hospitality with which they received things Roman. That the influence of Rome as concerned the laws was opposed to the concrete Germanic picturesqueness and operated toward a statement of law in general terms rather than for the particular case becomes apparent when the Old English laws are compared with the Old Frisian.

The Old Frisian *Küren*, *Überküren*, land laws, and excommunication

¹ *Corpus Iuris Germanici Poeticum*, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, I, p. 257; II, p. 302; *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XIII, p. 139; *Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte*, V, pp. 32, 226; VII, p. 131.

² For some late results of their imperfect conversion, see Aldo Ricci, *The Eleventh Century Crisis, The Review of English Studies*, V, 1929, pp. 1 ff.

³ *Dio saunde kest is dat alle Fresen oen fria stoele bisitte, also fyr sose fri boren se, ende fri spreke hadde: dat io him koningh Kaert, om dat hya Cristen worden.* (The seventh grant is that all Frisians may occupy their land in freedom, if they are free born, and have the right of free speech. That King Charles gave them when they became Christian.) K. von Richthofen, *Friesische Rechtsquellen*, Berlin, 1840, p. 11.

formula¹ are highly poetic. Parallel structure in sentences, repetition, rhyme, alliteration are the more obvious adornments, and of these alliteration is by far the most common. Almost inevitably it is found in passages where both diction and rhythm point to poetic composition. It serves to bind together the two members of the numerous law formulas and to provide less formal adornment in more extended uses. Of the formulas the following list is illustrative:

dath and dolg (mortal blow and wound), R. 57, 19.
 tha fiunde alsa friunde (foes as friends), R. 6, 9.
 mith rethe ende mith riuchte (with right and with law), R. 5, 22.
 widuon and weson (widows and orphans), R. 19, 22.
 a pet and a pol (in puddle and in pool), R. 125, 9.
 mith wegke and mith weine (with horse and with carriage), R. 122, 10.
 henzeg and hereg (dependent and subordinate), R. 11, 16; 15, 17.
 diape and dimme (deep and dark), R. 46, 30; 47, 14.
 habba and halda (to have and to hold), occurring oftenest in the form,
 te hebbane and te haldene, R. 130, 5; 132, 4; 247, 20; 81, 6; 343, 7; 102, 23; 425, 3;
 427, 23; 431, 22; 439, 30; 441, 14, 25; 180, 22.
 te suithe ne stride (neither to contend nor strive), R. 12, 3.
 stifhtte and sterkde (founded and established), R. 133, 11; 134, 17; 247, 4; 343, 14;
 246, 24.

There are very poetic compounds also of adjective and noun, as in *thiu neilthiustere nacht* (the misty-dark night), R. 36, 11; 46, 12; 72, 25; 37, 11; *thi heta hunger* (the hot hunger), R. 46, 3; 45, 24; *thi salta se* (the salt sea), R. 43, 9; 122, 7; or *thet wallande weter* (the welling water), R. 420, 18. Besides the phrases there is a less formal use, as in *hwersame wif halat mith horne and mith lude, mith dome and mith drechte, thet hiu emmer skolde aftne stol bisitta* (whoever marries a woman with horn and music, with law and right, let him occupy the marriage seat), R. 98, 17-20.

Kögel and Heyne have attempted to arrange some of these compounds as alliterative verse², and though the rhythm does not perfectly fit the familiar pattern, the evidence for poetic form is strengthened by the very poetic conceptions that appear in the concrete imagery of the laws. Something akin to the art that produced the kennings is indicated in certain terms. The gallows, for example, was the *northhalde tre* or *north-halde bam*, for the reason, apparently, that the north was the source of all mediæval woes, and the very name became synonymous with evil. Borchling and Grimm³ have noted many evidences of the love for the concrete in the reckoning of relationship by the knee and of compensation for a wound by the number of fingers it took to cover it⁴. Concrete

¹ For all these laws, see Richthofen, *op. cit.*

² See above, pp. 268 f.

³ *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁴ Cf. the punishment for wounding a man in the back, Richthofen, pp. 23 ff., 85.

and poetic also are the expressions for time and space. Distance is measured (R. 440 b, 15–18) by ‘as far as the wind blows and the world stretches’; and in the laws of the Westergoer (R. 491, 3), ‘as far as the wind blows, the grass is green, the trees blossom, the sun revolves, and the world stands.’

The most highly imaginative and concrete of all these passages is found in the laws governing the right of a widow to dispose of her children’s inheritance. It is clear that the author of these statutes saw the law in its particular applications and that his aim was an emotional effect. The second and third cases in which it becomes legal for a woman to sell such property are thus described (R. 46 b ff.):

Thiu other ned istet: ief ther erghe ier werthe, anthi heta hunger ur theth lond fare, and theth kind hunger sterwa will; sa moet thiu moder hire kindes eruue setta and sella, and capia him ther mithe ku and korn, anda alsa dene ting ther hiu him thes lives mithe helpe.

Thiu thredde ned istet: huuersa ther kind is stoknaked ieftha huslas, and thenna thiu thiustera nacht and thi nedtkalda winter ur tha thuner hleth; sa farther alra monna hwelic inna sin hof and inna sin hus, and theth wilde diar secht thene hola bam and thera berga hli, alder hit sin lif on behalde; sa weniath thet vniereghe barn, and werpth thenna tha sine nakeda lite and sin huuslase, and sinne feder, ther him reda scholde with thene heta hunger, theth hi sa diape and sa dimme is, vnder ehe and vnder eerthe, bislaghen, and biseten and bitacht. Hir vmbe sa mot thiu moder hire kindes eruue setta and sella, vmbe theth hiu aget pli and plicht, alsa longhe sa hit (vnierich is).

(The second case is: when the evil time of year comes and the hot hunger fares through the land, and the child is about to die of hunger, then shall the mother sell and dispose of her child’s property and buy with the return a cow and such things with which she can save his life.)

(The third case is: whenever the child is stark-naked and houseless and then the dark night and the bitter-cold winter comes down from the storm, when every man goes into his court and into his house and the wild animal seeks the hollow tree and the ravines of the mountain to save his life; when the little child cries and wails over his naked limbs and his houselessness, and mourns for his father who would have helped him against the cold winter and against the hot hunger, but who is now shut up and imprisoned and covered over with oaken boards and earth—then shall the mother dispose of and sell her child’s property, because she has justification and reason for doing so, as long as it [the child] is a minor.)

Old English law can offer no parallel to the poetry of the Old Frisian and the Old Norse¹ documents. We may, therefore, conclude that those tribes which escaped longest the Christian influence kept the poetic cast which seems to have characterised Germanic legal speech in pre-Christian times, and that in certain specific phrases of the Old English laws and in a tendency to alliteration wherever the subject matter was archaic or of emotional importance, we still have traces of the vanishing tradition.

DOROTHY BETHURUM.

APPLETON, WISCONSIN.

¹ On the poetic qualities and alliteration in Old Norse laws, see Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, ch. I, and Sievers, *op. cit.*

GRACIÁN'S 'AGUDEZA Y ARTE DE INGENIO'

I.

IN the year 1648 there appeared in Huesca, 'por Juan Nogues, al coso,' the second edition and final form of the longest of Gracián's works and the most purely technical. Its title, *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* (which might be rendered by 'Keeness and the mind's art'), sufficiently indicates, once these strange terms are understood, the nature and the object of the work. 'Keeness,' *agudeza*, is here to be taken as intellectual sharpness (*agudeza* is acuteness in the cutler's acceptation), or in a more exact but unsympathetic English equivalent: 'smartness'.¹ 'The mind's art' is this keeness or smartness, and it seems therefore implied that such keeness is the function of the mind. Gracián's object, then, is to expound intellectual activity. This is borne out by the sub-title which reads: *en que se explican todos los modos y diferencias de conceptos* . . . , 'in which are explained all the modes and differences of conceits.' The mental art of the author is the conceit, and he appears to assign to it an exclusive right to be considered the noblest intellectual function.

Gracián is not lacking in a high estimation of his theme, but his attitude is more likely to puzzle and repel the modern reader than attract him. For despite the important part that the conceit has played in Italian, Spanish and English literature, no student of these literatures has shown any great inclination to analyse the nature of the mental device or rhetorical flourish of the conceit. This is all the more surprising when we remember that the problem is simplified for the conceit, differing as it does totally from all other modes of expression, though here no less, perhaps, are involved the fundamental problems of all thought and expression.

In his introduction ('al lector'), Gracián states that he has formerly devoted some of his works to judgment, and but recently 'the art of prudence,' but that now he dedicates this book to the intellect, the concept in art: 'flaming theory which though some of its subtleties are faintly seen in rhetoric, yet do they not reach so far as glimpses, for they are like orphan children who, their real mother not being known, were fostered on to Eloquence.' ('*Theórica flamante, que aunque se traslucen*

¹ L. P. Thomas, *Le lyrisme et la préciosité cultistes en Espagne*, translates *agudeza* by *acuité* (p. 151).

algunas de sus sutilezas en la retórica, aun no llegan a vislumbres; hijos huérfanos, que por no conocer su verdadera madre, se prohijaban a la Elocuencia.')

This gives us the first clue to the nature of the conceit, and warns us not to assign it to Rhetoric.

It is generally assumed that the conceit is some kind of figure of speech, and it is vaguely understood to be a twisted simile or a false analogy. But the conceit is something more than a figure of speech, and its analogy, if false, is yet accepted, when the conceit is successfully constructed, by the mind that apprehends it. It must be more than merely false analogy if it achieves an effect in the mind beyond that of conveying its falseness, and anyone who has fallen under the spell of a passage from Góngora or from one of the English 'metaphysicals' will testify to the peculiarly satisfying quality of the conceit. For example:

Pintadas aves—cítaras de pluma—
coronaban la bárbara capilla,
mientras el arroyuelo para oïlla
hace de blanca espuma
tantas orejas cuantas guijas lava,
de donde es fuente a donde arroyo acaba,

from Góngora's *Soledad primera* (ll. 564-9); or this from Donne's *Hymn in Sickness*:

Since I am coming to that holy room,
Where with thy quire of saints for evermore,
I shall be made thy music; as I come
I tune the instrument here at the door
And what I must do then, think here before.

The simile is but a simple step in the process of conveying information other than by direct statement, in so far as direct statement is ever possible. Everyone at some time has curiously awakened to the trite realisation that he cannot speak without rhetoric of some well-worn kind, and that all his more picturesque efforts in the art of conversation teem with complex figures of speech; so too with wit, which is almost always a matter of conceits, conceits that are hardly serious, just as there are conceits that in, say, religious expression are serious, and even solemn. Let us take a concrete case. If, to make use of Donne's example, I say, instead of 'I am ill,' 'I am foretasting death,' there is here only metaphor, but to continue: 'to die is to be made the instrument of God's music, therefore now I am tuning the instrument,' there is the essence of the conceit in the continuation of the original simile. This case is not a simple one, for besides being a continuation of the simile 'sickness is

as a foretaste of death,' there has been a tacit substitution of 'death' by 'being made God's music.' There is really a continuation of two similes in series. A simpler case is that of the Spanish example. The preliminary simile is: 'The foam that the stream makes on coming against a pebble is like an ear.' The simple continuation is: 'The stream makes of foam as many ears as it washes pebbles to listen to the bird's song.' Here an apparent reason is given justifying the preliminary and possibly fantastic simile¹.

Remembering Butler's much-quoted couplet from *Hudibras*, let us construct a home-made conceit. If I say 'The sun set in a sky as red as lobster,' we have merely a simile as incongruous as the original. If however I say 'The sun set in a sky as red as lobster, but though the lobster turns from black to red, the sunset sky turns from red to black,' and, I might continue, 'a symbol of the relative qualities of mere sunset and delightful lobster,' I produce the conceit and its justification. Since this example is not the work of poetic genius, it has the disadvantage of not being particularly striking or significant, but for this very reason, not obscuring the mind with an emotional reaction, it may serve to expose the essential nature of the conceit: continuation of the logical process started, or even only implied, by ordinary trope. In this case the continuation is made by exhibiting lack of similarity, or even contradiction, when at first we had suggested similarity, what Gracián terms 'agudeza por contradicción y repugnancia en los afectos y sentimientos del ánimo,' although here it is contradiction in the 'términos' rather than in the 'ánimo.'

In his introduction, Gracián says: 'Válese la Agudeza de los tropos como de instrumentos para exprimir cultamente sus conceptos, pero contiénense ellos a la raya de fundamentos materiales de la sutileza, cuando más de adornos del pensamiento.' That is, the figure of speech is limited to providing the ground for the conceit, the conceit itself is a more complex operation than the figure of speech. What it is, it is Gracián's intention to show us in the first part of the book.

The book is divided into sixty-three 'Discursos,' each purporting to deal with one kind of conceit; it is obvious from the number that this

¹ The continuation of the simple trope, which is essential for constructing a conceit, need not always be in the nature of a justifying argumentation as in the Góngora quotation, nor need it be the syllogistic type of argument implied in Donne's example which, as we said, is additionally complicated by the silent substitution of one simile by another equivalent one. We shall see that Gracián classifies the ways of continuing the metaphor, indeed the attempt at such a classification is precisely the object of the book. The first here quoted he would call: 'concepto por propuesta extravagante y la razón que se da de la paradoja'; and the second: 'argumento conceptuoso' or 'ingeniosa ilación.'

cannot be so, and we find that only the first sixteen discourses treat of the four fundamental modes of conceit ('modos de agudeza'), and that the majority of the remaining forty-seven discourses are variations in the application of these modes, as will presently be shown. These forty-seven discourses do not imply so many possible manners of application; several times two or more discourses are devoted to the same, or to a nearly related type. At the fiftieth discourse, the first part of the *Agudeza* ends. The second part is devoted to 'compound conceits,' by which is meant long-sustained works composed of conceits combined together. This is a not very successful attempt to include all kinds of literary art under the conceptist method. Gracián yields to a temptation few theorists can resist, that of supposing that their single theory will cover all phenomena. In this second part, also, there is a discourse devoted to the consideration of style, and another to the sources of the conceit.

In the first discourse, Gracián states that, as the ancients discovered the rules of thought in logic and of expression in rhetoric, so he will discover the art and rules of the conceit. 'Hallaron los antiguos método al silogismo, arte al tropo; sellaron la agudeza, o por no ofenderla, o por desahuciarla, remitiéndola a sola la valentía del ingenio,' and: 'Pero no se puede negar arte donde reina tanta la dificultad. Armase con reglas un silogismo, fórjese pues con ellas un concepto' (Discourse 1). Gracián continues that authors in the past have usually had their conceptism criticised on the ground of sameness and lack of freshness, he proposes the kinds of conceit so that these may be more freely used and produce greater variety: 'Censúranse en los más ingeniosos escritores las agudezas antes por unas que por únicas, y homogéneos sus conceptos... y es que falta el arte por más que exceda el ingenio.'

He starts off by defining the psychological assumptions lying behind his theories, and quotes the scholastic doctrine, or rather in the language of the schools refers to the obvious fact that 'Tiene cada potencia un rey entre sus actos, y un otro entre sus objetos, entre los de la mente reina el Concepto, triunfa la Agudeza.' We therefore see at once that, for Gracián, conceits are the very highest act of the mind.

The second discourse continues this idea, restating it in an interesting way; he says 'lo que para los ojos es la hermosura, y para los oídos la consonancia, eso es para el Entendimiento el concepto,' whence we may infer that the conceit, this function of the mind, is a kind of artistic beauty. He does indeed repeat farther on in the same discourse 'no se contenta el ingenio con sola la verdad, sino que aspira a la hermosura,'

where necessarily a beauty other than the kind which satisfies sight is meant¹.

The art of the conceit is for Gracián really a part, if not the whole, of literary art, beyond and distinct from rhetoric which merely deals with the construction and use of figures. In halting terms and entirely relying on the excessive divisioning and redivisioning of orthodox philosophy, he affirms that, as all things are in sympathy with the different powers of the soul that produce or observe them, so the conceit must be equal to the mind that perceives or creates it, and that, as the cause of this sympathy is proportion in the things themselves and is what pleases the power that corresponds to it, so the cause of the conceit's ability to please the mind or intellect must also be harmony and proportion, and he continues: 'Resaltan más con unos que con otros los extremos cognoscibles, si se unen, y el correlato que es realce de sutileza para uno, es lastre para otro.' (A first hint this of the question of taste.)

To understand the next step in the discovery of the nature of the conceit, it is better to read first what he says in the fourth discourse about the essential and fundamental kind of conceit 'de correspondencia y proporción.' The passage runs:

Es el sujeto sobre quien se discurre y pondera, ya en conceptuosa panegiri, ya en ingeniosa crisi, digo alabando o vituperando, uno como centro, de quien reparte el discurso líneas de ponderación y sutileza a las entidades que lo rodean; esto es a los adjuntos que lo coronan: como son sus causas, sus efectos, atributos, calidades, contingencias, circunstancias de tiempo, lugar, modo, etc., y cualquiera otro término correspondiente. Valos careando de uno en uno, con el sujeto, y unos con otros entre sí, y en descubriendo alguna conformidad o conveniencia que digan, ya con el principal sujeto, ya unos con otros, exprímela, pondérala, y en estos está la sutileza.

In the same discourse he adds later:

Hállase simetría intelectual entre los términos del pensamiento, tanto más primorosa que la material entre columnas y acroteras, cuanto va del objeto del ingenio al de un sentido.

This conception of things as consisting in relationships which make fit objects of comparison is at the root of the idea of the conceit, and at the bottom of all discourse. It differs from the notion implied by mere figures by the presence of the idea that it is relationship among

¹ It is always difficult to define Gracián's doctrines except by inference. This is of course especially difficult in such books as the *Criticón* which are definitely intended as artistic works, or the *Oráculo* in its aphoristic form. But even here, in a book supposed to be a theoretical treatise, anything not directly and exclusively concerned with the conceit has to be deduced, and of course with the greatest care; this applies, as here, to general ideas on beauty and art contained in his explicit doctrines. Nevertheless it would seem justifiable to conclude from this passage that Gracián understood by beauty two things quite separate and distinct: a beauty that pleases physically, and an intellectual beauty that resides only in an interior and mental form. This distinction is not without its importance and interest when we survey the jungle of nineteenth-century æsthetic theory.

the things that makes the conceit possible, for it is this that constitutes the basis of that continuation of the mere figure that is the conceit, whether that continuation be an argument of justification or merely discursive. The foundation of the figure, on the other hand, lies only in the fact of similarity among things. The peculiar power of the conceit resides in the fact that it is a relationship among things that is only apparent, or verbally in the names of them, but which nevertheless is justified from an imaginary or other non-material—unworldly—point of view.

Gracián defines the conceit then, in Discourse II, with this idea in his mind, and says: 'Es un acto del entendimiento que exprime la correspondencia que se halla entre los objetos.' A point, however, which Gracián does not insist on, and which, as we have just indicated, would seem to be true, is that the conceit although reposing on this foundation, has not yet really begun at this stage. We generally assume the conceit to be, in a general kind of way, a false analogy of some kind, yet effective even if false, because susceptible of justification, or discourse, in a continuation or prolongation of the first analogy. Gracián himself realised this, for in a later discourse devoted to 'semejanza,' similarity, he is more than doubtful whether mere similarity contains 'agudeza,' and whether it is not necessary for the production of conceit to extend the similarity on a second ground not at first perceived, or at least not mentioned. In his anxiety to include all processes of thought and all types of expression in his conceptist scheme, he tended to press the invasion of the conceit into regions where it does not properly belong, and conversely to admit conceit when it is not in fact present, as in this case of 'semejanza.'

The final point to observe in this second discourse is the insistence on: 'Esta correspondencia es genérica a todos los conceptos, y abraza todo el artificio del ingenio, que aunque éste sea tal vez por contraposición y disonancia, aquello mismo es artificiosa conexión de los objetos.' He has here repeated the essential quality of the conceit (for trope is satisfied with epithet or simple statement, at most abbreviated, or 'telescoped' as in metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy and the rest), as being an act of mental comparison in which objects are placed in juxtaposition and shown in their different aspects to be similar or dissimilar, and, although it does not appear from this quotation, it becomes abundantly clear, as we are given example after example, and in such phrases as 'judgment ("juicio") is satisfied with truth, whereas understanding ("ingenio") with beauty' (beauty here is 'agudeza'), that this similarity or dissimilarity

is not necessarily 'real' or 'true,' but fanciful, and that the comparison is not of the scientific kind, which states factual resemblance, but of the mental, dream kind, stating truths of the fancy. For the moment let us bear in mind that an important, indeed an essential part of the conceit is indicated in the words 'objects in juxtaposition.'

Having thus defined the essence of the conceit, Gracián next considers the classification of the conceit into its various modes, and finally resolves them into four, although it is a defect of his terminology that he continues to use the word 'modo' even when he is considering what are really only applications or utilisations of 'modos,' as when, e.g., in Discourse XLVIII, he considers 'apodos' as a pure mode, when it is but a method of applying any one of the fundamental modes that he has considered in Discourses IV to XV. With very rare exceptions, all the discourses after the fifteenth are similarly methods of applying the conceit.

Before examining these four modes, it is interesting and instructive to see what other classification Gracián considers and rejects. First he postulates (again following scholastic tradition) that difference could be of essence or of accident, both being sufficient to 'adorn *agudeza*.' The first distinction is between 'keenness,' '*agudeza*,' of perspicacity, and that of artifice, '*artificio*,' or, as we should say, the distinction between the faculty for discovering the quality of the conceit in external reality, or alternatively, material therein for the conceit, and the faculty for inventing conceits. The latter faculty is the subject of our study, '*ésta es el asunto de nuestra Arte*.'

Another way of classifying on which Gracián touches is to distinguish between the conceits of thought and those of word; a third division is that of action distinguished from that of word. 'But,' says Gracián, 'this distinction is one of accident rather than of essence,' and continues:

Más propiamente se dividiera en *Agudeza* de correspondencia y conformidad entre los extremos objetivos del concepto, que son los correlatos que une para la artificiosa sutileza, . . . La otra es *Agudeza* de contrariedad, o discordancia entre los mismos extremos del concepto. Pero esta división de la *Agudeza* no abarca todas sus especies, como las Crisis, exageraciones y otras.

A fifth way is to consider '*agudeza pura*' and '*agudeza mixta*,' that is combinations of more than one mode. Still another method of classification is to distinguish between simple ('incompleja') and compound ('compuesta'); this is the division above referred to which determines the separation of the book as a whole into two parts, in the second of which an attempt is made to include under the head of '*Agudeza compuesta*' all the major types of lengthier composition. Gracián therefore

accepts this division, and then proceeds: 'Vuélvese a dividir la Agudeza incomplexa en sus géneros y modos, y se reducen a cuatro como raíces, fuentes del conceptear.' These four are: (i) 'de correlación,' (ii) 'de ponderación,' (iii) 'de raciocinación,' (iv) 'de invención.'

These are now considered in turn in the next dozen discourses. But it is not clearly stated how this sixth, fourfold division differs from the fourth quoted above which had reduced the conceit to two kinds, that of likeness and that of unlikeness, nor is it to be explained in what way this last classification contains anything to distinguish the two. However, we have seen how the essence of the conceit lies in the approximation of two elements for purposes of a prolonged comparison, either by demonstrating likeness or its contrary; it is not really important if Gracián failed to maintain any very rigid classification of the ways of carrying out this comparison.

Taking the four in order, we have: correspondence, proportion: the essence of this seems to be to discover proportion between the extremes or terms of the percepts made use of; it is in this discourse that the passage already quoted occurs: 'Hállase simetría...,' etc., which makes of all objects a collection of relationships with the rest of reality. This discourse proceeds, noting such points as that the more violent the juxtaposition of the terms (or extremes, elements), the more striking and effective the conceit; that the juxtaposition may be between any 'attributes¹'; finally stating that this correlation will be all the more ingenious (conceptist therefore), if, rather than being discovered actually to exist, it is invented in the imagination or the fancy. Examples of this manufactured correspondence are given from Martial, the preacher Andrada, Quevedo and others (Discourse II)².

Another discourse (the fifth) is given up to the other aspect of this type of conceit, that of impropportion, which consists in finding an inverse

¹ The copiousness of Gracián's vocabulary is a very real drawback to the clarity of his exposition. 'Extremo,' 'término,' 'atributo' are here all synonymous. Much the same occurs with 'agudeza,' 'sutileza' and 'concepto,' though at other times distinctions seem to be suggested between these words.

² For example Andrada's conceit in a sermon on St Agnes: 'Que sin duda se adelantó la gracia a la gloria en hermosearla; previnola, no la dejó qué hacer; de suerte que realzó la gracia a los efectos de la gloria, y la belleza mortal a la inmortal.' Here the preacher invents a correspondence between nature and the eternal life of the saint. Grace (which is, of course, received only during the term of life here below) beautified her so much that the glorified life could add nothing to her loveliness; the conceit consists in the justification of the superiority given to nature over the beatific vision, in itself an absurdity. This is not a conceit founded on facts, for there is nothing in the history of the saint to justify such transposition, it is sheer invention to justify the hyperbole which the preacher has allowed himself. It is interesting to observe that the passage is redeemable from any charge of unorthodox extravagance by making grace the instrument of this supreme beauty which the saint is made to enjoy even during her natural existence.

relationship, a proportionate dissimilarity between the 'terms'; examples are given from every kind of source: 'Fórmanse por artificio contrapuesto a la proporción...' (the type we have just dealt with), 'allí se busca la correspondencia, aquí al contrario: la oposición entre los extremos¹.' This discourse ends with the following words, confirming what has already been said about the absence of any real further classification, at least, as Gracián himself would have said, as to essence:

Estas son las agradables proporciones y improporciones del discurso; concordancia y disonancia del concepto, fundamento y raíz de todo el artificio conceptuoso, porque o comienza o acaba en esta armonía de los objetos correlatos, como se verá en todas las demás especies, por eso se le proponen en primer lugar al Ingenio.

The next three discourses (VI, VII and VIII) consider 'la agudeza por ponderación.'

Consiste el artificio en levantar misterio entre la conexión de los extremos o términos del sujeto... y después de ponderada aquella coincidencia y unión, dase una razón sutil y adecuada que la satisfaga... de suerte que dos partes incluye esta Agudeza, la una es la ponderación y la otra es la razón que se da, y ésta es la principal formalidad de esta Agudeza.

There is a special consideration of those 'ponderations' in which it is difficult to establish in the second part of the conceit the satisfactory relationship which is to provide the answer to the 'ponderation' (expression of surprise or wonder at a thing) of the first part:

Añade esta especie de Agudeza al artificio de la ponderación misteriosa la dificultad entre la conexión de los extremos, digo los términos correlatos; y después de bien exprimida la dificultad, o discordancia entre ellos, dase una razón que la desempeña.

Discourse VIII deals with the acme of this type: 'Ponderaciones de contrariedad,' in which is 'pondered' not merely a mysterious relationship, nor even one difficult to justify, but actually one that is or appears to be contradictory. 'Unir a fuerza de discurso dos contradictorios extremos, extremo aguraye de la sutileza².'

¹ This (anonymous) example has the merit of being brief, it refers to St Laurence, who was martyred by grilling:

Serán tus entrañas crudas
sepulcro de un cuerpo asado.

The 'crudas entrañas' are those of his judge to whom he addressed the remark from the grill, 'Assum est, versa et manduca,' a quip which is sufficiently conceptistic on its own account to inspire Baroque preachers and poets, and sufficiently ironical and stoic to delight the Spaniards. St Laurence, like 'Lorenzo' Gracián himself, was (according to Spanish tradition) an Aragonese.

² As an example of 'ponderación,' this verse from Góngora's *Comedia de las firmezas*:

A mi Serafín vestido
hallé de un azul turquí,

which forms the statement of 'ponderation,' the concluding couplet gives the justifying reason for the thing pondered:

que no se viste de menos,
que del cielo un serafín.

Note how much depends on the name here. The function of 'cielo' in this second half is itself conceptistic, apart from justifying the foregoing. As an example of the more difficult type, Gracián gives us:

The next five discourses are concerned with 'agudeza por semejanza' and its varieties. This is the third class of conceits in the fourfold classification given in Discourse III, there called 'de raciocinación.' It is difficult to see how that term can be applied here. There is no doubt in any case that by 'semejanza' Gracián means the simile as understood in rhetoric. This is a mode of comparison resulting in an equation between two elements; perhaps this could have been considered also as a type of correspondence in attributes, but it was in any case convenient to make a special consideration of it and its ramifications apart. Gracián defines this type of conceit thus:

En este modo de conceptear, caréase el sujeto no ya con sus adjacentes propios, sino con un término extraño, como imagen que le exprime su ser, o le representa sus propiedades, efectos, causas, contingencias y demás adjuntos, no todos sino algunos, o los más principales.

He then adds the following afterthought:

No tienen algunos por Agudeza la semejanza pura, sino una de las flores retóricas; pero no se puede negar sino que es conceptuosa y sutileza de la inventiva.

This last is mere assertion on the part of Gracián, and it seems difficult to prove that an ordinary simile is a conceit unless recourse is had to some exceptional case, which is what Gracián does:

En la misma semejanza pura se hallan sus primores de Ingenio, que la realzan grandemente, con una sola se pueden exprimir dos contrarios efectos; así D. Luis de Góngora:

Que los dos nos parecemos
al roble, que más resiste
los soplos del viento airado,
tu en ser dura, yo en ser firme.

Now it is possible to consider this example from two points of view, and the case is an interesting example of how thin the partition may become between mere figure and full conceit. First we may think of this simile as a conceit owing to the fact that the first comparison proposed is difficult of justification, since the poet suggests that two persons of opposite sentiments are each like the same object, an oak. On the other hand one may say that there is no conceit here, and that the poet is making an unreal distinction, or rather an unconvincing distinction, between the hardness and the firmness of the oak, and even that there is not so great a difference in quality between the hardness of the lady and the persistence of the lover. In any case, the matter is decided

As an example of the	Nocte pluit tota; redeunt spectacula mane, divisum Imperium, cum Iove Caesar habet. contradictory 'ponderation': Thays habet nigros; niveos Lecania dentes. Quae ratio est? emptos habet haec, illa suos.	(Virgil.)
		(Martial.)

empirically, for the quotation is not by any means an example of the satisfying conceit. 'Le falta alma de sutileza.' However that may be, Gracián rather retracts his statement later, in the tenth discourse, that mere simile may be a conceit. He says then:

No cualquier semejanza (en opinión de muchos) contiene en sí sutileza ni pasa por concepto, sino aquéllas que incluyen alguna otra formalidad de misterio, contrariedad, correspondencia, improporción, sentencia, etc. Estas (dicen) son objetos de esta Arte, incluyen a más del artificio retórico, el conceptuoso; sin el cual no serían más que tropos, o figuras sin alma de sutileza.

Whether this is Gracián's own statement or whether he is really quoting another writer on the subject, or repeating discussions on the matter with the poets and writers that he frequented, Gracián accepts this amplifying statement, and thereby apparently nullifies the attitude of Discourse IX, in so far as he there inclines to admit any simile as a conceit. The rest of Discourse X is occupied with the discussion of other modes with which 'la semejanza pura' may be combined to elevate it to the dignity of a conceit, in other words with the combinations that will afford ground for the continuation of the figure that is essential for the construction of the conceit. For, here again, that principle is capable of application. The distinction between the rhetorical simile and the conceptist simile obeys Gracián's ruling already quoted: 'Válese la Agudeza de los tropos y figuras retóricas como de instrumentos para exprimir cultamente sus conceptos, pero contiénense ellos a la raya de fundamentos materiales de la sutileza'; that is to say that figures are the ground, the matter for the formation of the conceit, that to constitute it, there must be a second justifying reason for the simile, which is brought out (understanding of course that the 'reason' may be poetical or fanciful only), or else that the simile is established between terms that at first sight offer no ground, real or easily imagined, for such an approximation. We have just seen from the example of Góngora's verse that a simile may sometimes be considered from either point of view. Another example, less complex and indecisive, may be of help. To say 'my love is like fire' is hardly a conceit, but rather an obvious simile; it will not even develop into a conceit if I give the reason for my comparison such as saying 'my love is fierce like fire,' or 'purifying like fire,' because all these elaborations are merely information, not an additional simile. To add, however, that 'Like fire also my love consumes itself to dust and ashes' will bring the simile into the realm of the conceit, because there I have found an additional reason for the original comparison, and have utilised the first simile to establish the second hitherto hidden one; for I doubt whether it would have been a conceit to say from the

first 'my love dwindles to dust and ashes,' yet it might once more cross the border to the *conceptuoso* if I said 'my love has dwindled to dust and ashes that once was a bright flame'; for here, although we have the second part placed first, it still derives an additional force by being shown to rest on the presupposed preliminary comparison with a flame. The truth would seem to be that, because we are able to find an additional reason for comparison with the same thing, love with flame or fire when bright, and with flame or fire when burnt out, we are able thereby to construct the conceit, i.e., the simile is able to be prolonged. (The question here enters as regards our example just given, as to effectiveness of presentation; clearly the first presentation was infinitely more striking than the second, where the furtherance of the simile was given away at the beginning of the sentence, and really not seen to be more than a simile, a prolongation, until we had heard the second half—except, of course, that whereas fire does not necessarily suggest ashes, ashes imply previous fire. This question of presentation is frequently touched on by Gracián, especially in the later discourses¹.)

Three more discourses are devoted to various types of conceptuous simile. Discourses XIV, XV and XVI deal with the fourth fundamental type of conceit as given in Discourse IV, that formed 'por paridad.'

Here, again, there is a change in the nomenclature; for, in Discourse III, the fourth and last type of conceit was called 'de invención.' 'Este es el cuarto orden de conceptos,' says Discourse XIV, however, making it quite clear that the reference is to Discourse III:

que se funda también en el careo, del sujeto con algún término, no ya por semejanza, sino por disparidad. De esta paralela combinación salen las comparaciones, o disparidades conceptuosas, que pueden ladearse con la más agradable sutileza.

And later:

...pero es de notar que no cualquiera comparación encierra Agudeza, sino aquellas a quienes da pie y fundamento para el careo alguna circunstancia especial en que se funde la conformidad de los términos, para levantar la comparación conceptuosa que sin ésta no será sutileza, sino una desnuda figura retórica, sin viveza de ingenio, como se dijo de la semejanza y otras.

Here Gracián's experience of the difficulty in disentangling trope from conceit has borne fruit in this clear and definite preliminary statement.

As in the case of 'semejanza,' an example taken from the *Agudeza* may serve to show what 'conceptos por paridad' are. The first example

¹ This casting about for the additional cause for erecting the simile may possibly explain the name 'de ración.' It must be admitted, however, that the two terms 'ración' and 'semejanza' seem very wide apart. On the other hand there is no doubt that Gracián is adopting these four types, and discussing them in the present discourses; see below.

in the discourse is quite clear. It is a sonnet of Miguel de Ribellas, 'caballero valenciano,' to St Michael Archangel. The two tercets are:

Postrareme a tus (St Michael's) pies con tu licencia,
y allí do Lucifer está tendido,
juntos los dos haremos penitencia:
que si al mismo Señor tengo ofendido,
no queda entre él y mí más diferencia,
de estar él pertinaz, yo arrepentido.

From this example and others in the text, it is evident what the quality of this type of conceit is: the bringing together of two subjects not easily otherwise associable, in this case the poet and Satan. It is in fact the same basis as the type of conundrum 'Why is an X like a Y?' rests on. Possibly in this preliminary work of establishing, through some similar action or other attribute, the similarity of X and Y, lies the reason for calling the conceit 'de paridad,' 'de invención,' remembering the root meaning of the word: 'finding.'

It should be observed that this type also could have been considered as finding a correlation, or in the case of a 'disparidad,' its converse, an inverse relationship. But again Gracián has found it more workable to look on this type as a fourth and the last of the fundamental types of conceit.

The modes of conceit dealt with in the remaining discourses differ considerably in simplicity of construction from these four here considered in the Discourses iv to xv. These remaining discourses, xvi to LXIII, are dealt with elsewhere; as was stated above, generally the subsequent discourses consider what might better have been called by some such name as an 'application' of one of these four fundamental modes, modes which, we have already hinted, are in reality not four, but two only.

(To be concluded.)

E. SARMIENTO.

MANCHESTER.

‘DIE TEUFELSBEICHTE,’ EIN MITTELHOCH- DEUTSCHES EXEMPLUM

URSPRUNG, Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Predigtmärlein, der sogenannten Exempla, wurden von Miss M. D. Howie in den *Studies in the Use of Exempla* (London, 1923) und von J. Th. Welter in dem umfassenden Werk: *L'Exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du Moyen âge* (Paris, 1927) eingehend dargestellt. Das hier veröffentlichte Exemplum von ‘des tufels bihte’ hat meines Wissens ausser einer kurzen Erwähnung der Pariser Hs. und der Quelle auf Grund eines Hinweises durch ihren Lehrer Professor R. Pribsch bei Miss Howie (S. 52) bisher noch keine textkritische Betrachtung gefunden. Die Quelle der *Teufelsbeichte* findet sich im *Dialogus Miraculorum*, dem im Mittelalter weit verbreiteten kulturgeschichtlich interessanten Werk des Caesarius von Heisterbach (gest. 1240). Das Capitulum xxvi der ‘Distinctio tertia’ des *Dialogus*¹ bringt ein Zwiegespräch zwischen einem Mönch und einem Novizen über eine Teufelsbeichte. Es ist betitelt: ‘De confessione cuiusdam daemonis’ und handelt von einem Teufel, welcher ‘cum tempore quadragesimali’ zur Beichte geht, aber wegen seiner Hoffart die Gnade Gottes nicht erlangen kann.

Zweifellos ist dieses lateinische Predigtmärlein als die Grundfabel der *Teufelsbeichte* anzusehen, welche uns in vier Hss.² überliefert ist. Meiner textkritischen Ausgabe liegt hauptsächlich die Pariser Hs. (MS. Allemand 117, fol. 102^a, Bibliothèque Nationale) zugrunde, weil ein Vergleich der Lesarten die übrigen Hss. D, B (Dyck)³ entschieden schlechter als P erscheinen lässt. Die Gesamtüberlieferung dieser mittelhochdeutschen geistlich-didaktischen Stücke geht augenscheinlich auf eine schon verderbte Vorlage (X) zurück und vielleicht ist dieser Archetypus auch schon gelegentlich interpoliert.

Die Dresdener Hs.⁴ (MS. 60, fol. 82^b) ist eine fragmentarische Sammel-Hs. (V. 75–112 fehlen) und zwar im Gegensatz zu P illustriert. Auf fol. 82^b stehen zwanzig Verse über die zehn Gebote, dann in Rot: ‘Dis ist des tufels bihte.’ Darunter auf der zweiten Hälfte der Seite ist ein

¹ Caesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi ordinis Cisterciensis *Dialogus Miraculorum*, herausgegeben von Joseph Strange, Köln, 1851.

² Ich verdanke Professor R. Pribsch diese Angaben.

³ Die Hs. Dyck (Rheinland, Schloss Dyck) kam zu spät und wird an anderem Orte behandelt werden.

⁴ M. Coronata Schardt (Nonne in Freiburg, Schweiz) verdanke ich eine Abschrift der Hs. D.

Bild von einem schwarzen Teufel, welcher vor einem weissgekleideten Priester (Dominikaner?) kniet, mit dessen Stola um den Hals. Fol. 83^a beginnt dann mit roter D-Initiale.

Die Berliner Hs. (MS. Germ. fol. 742, 137^b, Staatsbibliothek) ist ebenfalls eine fragmentarische Sammel-Hs. (V. 1–41 fehlen) mit kraftvollen Illustrationen. Auf die Titelüberschrift mit dem Bilde des Dämons (diesmal ohne die Stola-Fessel) vor dem Priester folgt 138^b: 'Er trat für in und sprach.' Der Schreiber von B ist nachlässig und steht vornehmlich der Hs. D nahe.

Die Sammel-Hs. Paris wurde in der ersten Hälfte des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts im Elsass geschrieben. *Des tufels bihte* erstreckt sich über fol. 102^a–108^b. Ein Vergleich mit der lateinischen Quelle zeigt, dass der ins vierzehnte Jahrhundert zu versetzende Dichter der mittelhochdeutschen Bearbeitung sehr selbständig vorgegangen ist. Wir wissen aber nicht, ob der Verfasser nicht schon eine erweiterte Fassung des Caesarius-Exemplums vor sich hatte. Der Teufel bekennt sich in P nicht nur als 'unus ex his qui cum Lucifero ceciderunt,' sondern auch als einen, der Adam und Eva, Judas, Kaiphas und Pilatus in ewige Verdammnis brachte. Die dramatisch gesteigerte Rede (V. 77, 99, 131 u.s.w.) des Teufels, welchem der Priester¹ die Stola als geistliche Fessel um den Hals wirft, und die Schlussaufforderung an die Sünder sind Zutaten des mittelhochdeutschen Dichters, der im Vergleich 'erger denne ein fuler hunt' (V. 21 und 61) wörtliche Parallelen zu *Der werlt lon*, einem von Konrad von Würzburg beeinflussten Gedicht in P, zeigt. Eine mittelniederländische Prosaversion der *Teufelsbeichte* gibt De Voos² wieder.

Sprache und Orthographie verweisen den Schreiber des P-MS. nach dem Elsass, wohl nach Strassburg. Er gehört ins noch nicht diphthongierende Gebiet (*bihte*) und zeigt charakteristische Eigentümlichkeit der niederalemannischen Mundart. Siehe Erwin Haendke, *Die mundartlichen Elemente in den elsässischen Urkunden des Strassburger Urkundenbuches*, 1261–1332, Inauguraldissertation, Strassburg, 1894. Niederalemannisch oder elsässisch ist die Verdampfung des *â* > *ô*: V. 18 (*koment—nt* ist Analogie zum Präs.), 33 und 52 (*gnose*), 96 (*jor*), 78 und 100 (*gedohte*). Auffallend ist daher die Form *gedehte* (33); vgl. *mendage* (11). Im Versinern herrscht *ô* vor, aber der Schreiber hat auch gelegentlich *â*: 49 (*han*), 175 und 219 (*gnade*). Im Reim jedoch ist stets des Dichters Form *â*:

¹ Vgl. J. Bolte, 'Der Teufel in der Kirche,' *Zs. f. vgl. Lit.-Gesch.*, N.F., XI, S. 249 ff., und J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. III, London, 1910.

² De Voos, *Mittelniederlandsche Legenden en Exempelen*, Leiden, 1900, S. 240–1.

49, 57, 58. Charakteristisch für das Elsässische ist auch die orthographische Bezeichnung des *iu* und *û* durch *û*. Die elsässische Verwandlung des *i* > *û* gebraucht der Schreiber in *nüt*: 135, 153, 186, 229, während der Dichter *nüt* auf *riet* reimt: 89–90. In einem Falle (209) hat der Dichter die Form *nîht* im Reim zu *geschîht*¹. Elsässisch ist ferner *i* > *u*: 178 (*wurt*) und *e* > *ô*: 9, 49 und 73 (*schöpfers*). Der Mundart des Schreibers gehört die Formanalogie an *dar* in Vers 149 (*har*) an. Vgl. Karl Weinhold, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, Paderborn, 1883. Alemannisch ist die Ausstossung des *r* in *welte* (156). Dem Schreiber fällt auch zur Last das *t* in *müssent* (76, 205), *wurdent* (87), ferner die bereits neuhochdeutsche Kürzung *ss*, z.B. in *verstossen* (72, 87), *lassen* (126); die kontrahierte Form *lan* steht in V. 57. Der Schreiber schreibt nur in seltenen Fällen das spirantische aus *t* verschobene *z* (96, 119). *S* wird geschrieben, wo *st* stehen sollte (30). *No* statt *nuo* (11) ist eine Verschreibung, wohl hervorgerufen durch das folgende *ô* in *hörent*. Die Adhortativendung in der 2. Pers. Plur. Ind. Pres. *-ent* statt *-et* (3, 11) ist sowohl elsässisch als auch rheinfränkisch, aber der Reim *geloubet* : *beroubet* (213–4) beweist, dass *-ent* nur des Schreibers Form ist.

Dass die Heimat des Dichters nicht wie die des Schreibers im Elsass, sondern im Rheinfränkischen liegt, wird vor allem durch den Reim *verraden* : *gnaden* (107–8) bewiesen. Dazu stimmt auch die *i*-(< *ie*) Form der Verba in dem freilich nicht beweisenden Reimpaar *befing* : *erhing* (111–12). Des Dichters Form ist *ê* in *herre*, sichergestellt durch den Reim V. 100. Im Versinnern vgl. 78, 125. Die Schreibung (*ng* >) *nk* (22, 161–2) im Auslaut ist eine beliebte Erscheinung rheinfränkischer Orthographie. Gegenüber der Affrikata *pf* im Versinnern (191) steht *f* im Reim (141–2), welches des Dichters Form ist. Vgl. Virgil Moser, *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik*, I, 1929.

Bemerkungen zur Flexion und Syntax. *Ruwen* (16, 228) ist schwaches Maskulinum². *Slange* (91) ist schwach. *Hertze* (193) Akk. Sg. Neutr.): *smertze* (Akk. Sg. Mask.) führt auf Apokope³ des *n* des schwachen Mask. *Würdest* (35) ist mögliche Form des Dichters, sonst gewöhnlich *würde*, mhd. 2. Pers. Sg. Der Akkusativ steht an Stelle des zu erwartenden Gen. in V. 51 (*daz...geruochet*) und 67 (*des...schuldig*); hier aber wie auch V. 119 ist *daz* durch den Reim sichergestellt. Das unflektierte Pronomen findet sich in V. 7, 55, 143 (*sin*, Akk. Sg. Fem.). Fraglich ist

¹ Vgl. die Reime auf *nî* im *Johan uz dem virgiere*, herausg. von R. Pribsch (*Germanische Bibliothek*, II, 32), S. 46, 48.

² Vgl. H. Paul, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, Halle, 1918, § 125.

³ Derselbe Reim steht im mittelfränkischen *Junker und der treue Heinrich*. Siehe Weinhold, § 458.

die flektierte Form *sinen* (26) für Akk. Mask.; es wäre hier auch *sin getruwen* möglich. Unflektierter unbestimmter Artikel steht in V. 44 (*ein*).

Metrik und Reimtechnik. Im grossen und ganzen zeigt die Rhythmik der *Teufelsbeichte* einen regelmässigen Aufbau. An einigen Stellen ist die Überlieferung verderbt (88, 141, 142, 184 u.a.). Umstellungen und ergänzende oder ändernde Eingriffe waren daher an einigen Stellen (88, 141 ff.) nicht zu vermeiden. Vierhebig stumpfe Reimpaare herrschen vor: 182 Reime und dazu das Reimpaar 81–2, welches jedoch auch konsonantisch unrein reimend und klingend aufgefasst werden kann. Vierhebig klingend: 27 Reime; dreihebig klingend: 17 Reime; dreihebig stumpf: ein Reimpaar 47–8. Hiatus steht in V. 17, 86, 89, 90, 113, 150, 156, 218. Apokope erscheint in 38, 61, 85 u.a., das apokopierte Pronomen in der Enklise: *wil'ch* in V. 60, 154, 188, 204, 215. Inklinatlon des Pron. bzw. Verschleifungen sind nicht selten: *rihter* (17), *inz* (18), *zer* (103) u.a. Synkope ist in *vlorn* (95). Zweisilbige Senkungen (z.B. 9, 17, 18), Verschleifung auf der Höhe (29, 30) und Verschleifung auf der Senkung (2, 15, 68) sind häufig. Dreisilbige Senkung erscheint in V. 221.

Schliesslich lässt sich die Beobachtung machen, dass der Dichter an den einzelnen Pausen des Teufelsbekenntnisses wohl mit Absicht den Vers verlängert: V. 76 und 98 (5 Heber klingend), 130 und 199 (5 Heber stumpf), 200 (6 Heber stumpf), 220 (4 Heber klingend auf drei Heber folgend). Mit einem Dreireim schliesst die Dichtung ab, falls der Schluss nicht dem Schreiber angehört.

In einigen Fällen lassen sich Verse nur auf das Normalmass bringen, wenn man das *Inquit* als ausserhalb des Verses stehend ansieht: 33, 78 u.a. Es ist im Text in eckige Klammern gesetzt. Parenthetische Sätze stehen in runden Klammern. Auftaktlos sind die Verse: 22, 34, 35, 42 u.a. Neben ein- und zweisilbigem Auftakt wird auch dreisilbiger verwendet: 54, 73, 170; beschwerte Hebung in 6, 21, 67 u.a. Besonders hervorgehoben wird das betonte Wort durch beschwerte Hebung auf dem dritten Fuss: 12, 65, 71 u.a. Wiederholende Bindungen wie (*ver*)*nam*: *kam* (15–16, 25–6, 165–6), *rat*: *missetat* (55–6, 69–70, 229–30), ferner *not*: *dot* (129–30, 195–6), *üermüt*: *güt* (9–10, 181–2), *sach*: *sprach* (41–2, 103–4), *vernomen*: *komen* (101–2, 173–4) verraten Reimarmut¹. Unreine Reime sind nicht selten. Konsonantisch ungenau: *eze*: *breche* (93–4), doch konnte hier vielleicht *vergeze* eingesetzt werden; *drang*: *stanck* (21–2); überschüssiges *t* in *gast*: *glass* (27–8). In *sach*: *sprach* (41–2, 103–4) reimt germ. *h*, welches im Auslaut zu *ch* wird, mit germ. *k*. Die Reime

¹ Miss Howie's Notes (67) S. 52 stimmen hier nicht.

uz:hus (17-18), was:daz (95-6) und daz:Caiphaz (119-20) beweisen, dass zwischen s und z kein bewusster Unterschied mehr bestand. Auf die rheinfränkische Bindung verraden:gnaden (107-8), wurde schon hingewiesen. Wenn die Versergänzung V. 88 stimmt, wäre hier der Reim r:l zu verzeichnen. Konsonantisch und vokalisch unrein sind -at:-art (83-4). Die Unterdrückung des r ist besonders rhein- und südfränkisch. Vokalisch unrein sind man:getan (61-2) und nit:riet (89-90). Auch Herbot von Fritzlar reimt i:ie (Siehe W. Bachmann, S. 26). Der Reim u:uo (139-40) findet sich auch bei Gottfried (Siehe A. Schirokauer, *Studien zur mittelhochdeutschen reimgrammatik*, Paul und Braunes Beiträge, S. 47, Anm. 1). Der Reim gnaden:laden (49-50) beweist Dehnung in offener Silbe. Die Verse 141-2 sind in den Hss. und auch schon in der Vorlage verderbt; stole:walle könnte auf stôle:wôle (= wuole) in der Bedeutung 'befehlerisches Wesen, Kraft' zurückgehen, aber ô:uo, obwohl rheinfränkisch möglich, kommt sonst nirgends vor.

Meinem Text liegt die Fassung P zugrunde, weil deren Schreiber, wie schon erwähnt wurde, entschieden am wenigsten nachlässig ist. Im übrigen habe ich versucht, die der Heimat des Dichters entsprechende rheinfränkische Gestalt z.B. durch Monophthongierung von *ruwen*, *truwen* u.a. wiederzugeben. Es fehlt daher die Umlautbezeichnung¹.

Quelle des Gedichtes ist folgendes Exemplum aus dem *Dialogus Miraculorum* Caesarii Heisterbacensis (herausgegeben von Joseph Strange, Köln, 1851, S. 143-4):

Distinctio tertia, cap. xxvi: De Confessione cuiusdam daemonis.

Sacerdos quidam cum tempore quadragesimali in ecclesia sua sederet, et sibi commissorum confessiones audiret, aliis recedentibus atque aliis accedentibus, inter expectantes quidam stabat, quantum ad apparentiam, corpore iuvenis et robustus, confitendi tempus expectans. Omnibus expeditis, ipse novissimus accessit, coram sacerdote genua flexit, et ad confessionem os aperuit. Qui tanta et tam enormia confessus est crimina, tam multa homicidia, furta, blasphemias, periuria, discordiae seminaria et alia his similia, quorum se auctorem, incensorem sive suggestorem esse dicebat, ut sacerdos tam horrore quam taedio gravatus, diceret ad illum: Si mille esses annorum, nimis esset, tam gravia et tam multa te commisisse peccata. Ad quod verbum ille respondit: Amplius sum quam mille annorum. Tunc amplius territus sacerdos ait: Quis ergo es? Respondit ille: Daemon ego sum, unus ex his qui cum Lucifero ceciderunt. Peccata mea ex minima tibi parte confessus sum; si velles audire residua, quae sunt innumerabilia, paratus essem tibi confiteri. Sciens sacerdos peccatum diaboli fore insanabile, dixit: Quid tibi commune cum confessione, o diable? Respondit daemon: Stabam ex opposito tui, vidique peccatores ad te accedere, et iustos redire, auscultans valde diligenter quid illi dixerint, quidve eis

¹ Nachträgliche Lektüre der Arbeiten von Professor W. E. Collinson (*Ein lop von unser vrouwen*, *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Oct., 1911) und Dr J. Knight Bostock (*Albertus Braxiensis in Germany*, Oxford, 1924) bestätigen diese textkritische Untersuchung. Das Verhältnis der MSS. P, B, D (Dyck) zueinander ist noch ungeklärt. In einer Arbeit über Motivengeschichte, über den 'Waldbruder' und die Verweltlichung der Exempla hofft der Verfasser dieser Frage näher zu kommen.

responsum sit a te, et quod post gravia peccata promissa sit eis indulgentia vitaeque aeterna. Ego vero, idem sperans consequi, veni tibi peccata mea confiteri. Sacerdos vero, exemplo sancti Martini, diabolo fiducialiter respondit: Si volueris uti consilio meo, et agere poenitentiam de peccatis tuis pure, sicut hi, quos hinc exire vidisti, similem indulgentiam consequeris. Respondit daemon: Si tolerabilem mihi iniunxeris satisfactionem, parebo tibi. Ego, inquit sacerdos, valde modicam, et minorem his, qui ante te confessi sunt, tibi iniungam poenitentiam. Vade et tribus vicibus in die iacta te in terram; sicque prostratus dicas: Domine Deus creator meus, peccavi tibi, ignosce mihi. Hoc solummodo sit poenitentia tua. Cumque diabolus diceret: Non possum hoc facere, nimis est mihi grave; respondit sacerdos: Quare in tam modico gravaris? Non possum, inquit, me in tantum humiliare ei. Aliud quidquid iniunxeris, libens suscipiam. Tunc indignatus sacerdos, subiunxit: O diabole, si tanta est cordis tui superbia, ut nec velis nec possis te in tam modico humiliare Creatori tuo, recede a me, quia neque hic neque in futuro misericordiam ab illo consequeris. Ad quam vocem mox ille evanuit. Novicius: Mirum quod sic se superbus ille spiritus humiliare potuit homini, et non Creatori. Monachus: Hoc est quod David Deo dixit: *Superbia eorum*¹, id est, daemonum, *qui te oderunt, ascendit semper*. Unde statim in sequenti Psalmo subditur: *Confitebimur tibi, Deus, confitebimur*; quasi dicat: Nos homines confitebimur tibi corde, confitebimur et ore; daemones vero impenitentes sunt. Novicius: Cum peccator habeat os et linguam ad loquendum, sufficit ei, si peccata sua scripto confiteatur?

DIS SEIT VON DES TUFELS BIHTE.

- 1 Der tufel der begunde sinnen,
Ob er gotes hulde mohte gewinnen.
Daz horet, frouwen unde man,
Wer gotes wort vernemen kan,
- 5 Wo man von gûten dingen saget,
So sol ein man unverzaget
Sin oren hine neigen,
Do mit sol er erzeigen
Sinem schepfer einen willigen mût,
- 10 Der machet im sin ende gût.
Nû horet, also ich uch sage,
Daz geschah an einem mendage
Vor ostern als ich han vernomen;
Do was in eine kirche komen
- 15 Ein priester, der da bihte vernam.
Wer mit rehtem ruwen fur in kam,
Den rihter mit siner lere uz.
Ez kamen vil lute inz gotes hus.
Der tufel der bleib nû der vor,

Überschrift: D B Dis ist dis tufels bihte. 1 der fehlt in P D. Die Verse 1–41 fehlen in B. 3 horet] P D hörent. 6 so] D do. 8 erzeigen] P erzoygen D zoigen. 9 sinem schepfer] P sinen schöpfer D sime schöpfer; willigen P gewilligen. 10 im] P ime D eime; sin] P sine. 11 horet] P D hörent; also] D als. 12 geschah] D geschog; einem] D eime. 13 als] P also. 17 rihter] P rihtete er D rihte er. 18 kamen] P D koment; vil] D wil. 19 tufel der] der fehlt in P D; D Nû der tufel stund do wor.

¹ Druckänderung vom Herausgeber.

- 20 Er setzete sich uberz dor
 Und sach, wenn der mensche hin drang,
 Daz er von den sunden stang
 Noch erger denn ein fuler hunt.
 Daz werte schier bitz uf die stunt,
- 25 Daz der mensche fur den priester kam
 Und sinen truwen rat vernam.
 So wart er siner sunde ein gast,
 Daz er wart luter als ein glas.
 Der mensche kam dan wider hinfur.
- 30 Dennoch saz der tufel uber der tur.
 Er gesach den vor so fleckig was,
 Daz er nû was luter als ein glas.
 [Er gedahte:] 'Die gnade die du hast gesehen,
 Mohte ouch daz an dir geschehen,
- 35 Daz du wurde reine
 Als dise lute gemeine.
 Mich werte des do vil wol an.'
 Er stunt uff und maht' sich glich eim man.
 Er ging inn kor stan an die want,
- 40 Da er den priester sitzen vant.
 Do er den priester sitzen sach,
 Er trat fur in unde sprach:
 'Bistu der, der gemachen kan
 Reine als ein unfleckigen man
- 45 Und die sunde also vertriben
 Von mannen und von wiben?'
 Der bihter sprach al da:
 'Vil lieber meister, ia.
 Daz han ich von mins schepfers gnaden.
- 50 Wer mit sunden ist uberladen

20 *fehlt in D*; setzete] P satzelete. 21 mensche] P mensch; hin] D hie us. 22 stang] D stong. 23 denn] P denne D danne. 24 schier *fehlt in P D*. 25 mensche] P mensch; kam] D kom. 26 truwen] P D getruwen; rat] D Rot; vernam] P D nam. 27 siner] P sinen; sunde] P D sünden; gast] D gost. 28 als] P also. 29 dan] P denne; wider hinfur] D hin weder für. 30 dennoch] D do noch. 31 gesach] D sach; den] D der; vor] P dervor D ie; fleckig] P fleckehaftig. 32 er] D der; als] P also. 33 gedahte] P gedachte D gedohnte; gnade] P gnode D genod. 34 mohte] P möchte; ouch daz] D die ouch. 35 wurde] P wurdest D werdest. 36 als] P D also; dise] D die. 37 des *fehlt in P D*; wol *fehlt in P*. 38 glich] D gliche; eim] P D einem. 39 inn kor stan] P ston in den kor D sten an den kor. 40 da] P D do; sitzen] D sitzende. 41 *fehlt in P*; sitzen] D sitzende. 42 unde] P D B und. 43 der, der] P der der dis D B der dis; gemachen] D B machen. 44 als] P also. 45 *fehlt in P*. 48 vil] D wil; meister] D B priester 49 han] D B hab; mins] D mines; schepfers] P schöppfers D chopffers B schöpfer; gnaden] D genoden.

- Und daz er des gerüchet,
 Daz er gnade und barmung süchet
 Zu mir und daz mit ruwen tüt,
 So weiz ich got so bermig und so güt:
 55 Er vergibt im al sin missetat.
 'Ach, werter priester, gip mir rat,
 Sprach der tufel, 'ich wil dich wizzen lan,
 Allez daz ich han getan
 Und allez daz du fragest mich,
 60 Daz wil'ch dir sagen sicherlich.'
 'Dar so setz' dich, güter man,
 Und sage, waz du hast getan.'
 Er satzte sich hin nider san.
 'Sunde han ich me getan
 65 Dan mir umer güt sy,
 Wan ich bin von keime laster fry.
 Ich gibe mich schuldig daz,
 Daz ich by manegen funden waz,
 Da ich gap minen bosen rat
 70 In der ersten missetat,
 In der ersten hoffart,
 Dar umb lutzifer verstozen wart.
 Daz er sich satzte widern schepfer sin,
 Daz was ouch der rat min
 75 Und miner gesellen allen,
 Dar umb wir ewicliche musen vallen.'
 Der priester ein wenig erschrocken was.
 [Er gedahte:] 'Here got was rede ist daz.
 Diser mensche mag mich toren.'
 80 Doch begunde er furbaz horen.

51 *fehlt in D*; des] P B daz; gerüchet] B geruhtet. 52 gnade] P gnode D genade; barmung] P D B barmunge; süchet] D süchtet. 53 ruwen] D willen. 54 bermig] D barmig B barmhertzig. 55 vergibt] P vergibet D B vergebe; im] P ime D eime; al sin] P D B alle sine. 56 gip] P D B so gip. *Der Schreiber von B fügt noch einen Vers hinzu:* Das mir vergeben werde min missat. 57 lan] D lon. 59 daz *fehlt in D*; fragest] P frogest. 60 wil'ch] P D B wil ich. 61 dar] D der; setz'] P D setze; güter] D werder. 62 getan] B geton. 63 satzte] P satzete D B saste. 64 P D B Und; unde] B sünden; me] P D nie. 65 dan] P wenne D wan B wann; umer *fehlt in P D B*. 66 wan] P D wanne B wann. 67 daz] P dez. 68 manegen] P manigen D B manchen; funden] P B sünden. 69 da] P das D do; gap] D B habe; minen bosen *fehlt in P D B*. 70 in] D B an; ersten] B ernsten. 71 in] D B an; ersten *fehlt in P D B*; hoffart] B hochfart. 73 satzte] P satzete D saste B satzete; widern schepfer] P B wider den schöpfer (B schöpfer) D weder den schöpfer. *Die Verse 75–112 fehlen in D*. 76 musen] P müssen mit im B mit im müsten. 78 gedahte] P B gedachte; rede] P reden. 79 mensche] P B mensch; mich *fehlt in P B*.

- Der tufel sprach: 'Ich dün dir kundig,
 Daz ich bin ouch schuldig
 An der andern missetat:
 Do Adam geschaffen wart
 85 Und solt' besitzen an der vart
 Die gotes froide offenbar,
 (Da von wir verstozen wurden
 Von unseren grozen schulden)
 Daz engunde ich im nit.
 90 Satenase ich daz riet,
 Daz er in einer slangen wise
 Verkert' ver Eva mit der spise,
 Daz sie den Apfel eze
 Und daz gebot breche.
 95 Dar umb der mensche vloren was.
 Funf tusent jar umbé daz
 Was er verloren in der ahte,
 Bitz in got mit sime tode wider brahte.'
 Der priester erschrack gar sere.
 100 [Er gedahte:] 'Hilf got lieber here.
 Der bihte hast nie me vernomen.
 Ist der tufel fur mich komen?'
 Zer erden er da nider sach.
 Der tufel aber furbaz sprach:
 105 'Von Judas ich mich nie geschiet,
 Do er got verkoufte und verriet.
 Und do er hate got verraden,
 Do were er komen wol zu gnaden.
 Do schickete ich im daz leit,
 110 Daz er zwifelt' an gotes barmecheit.

81 dir] P B dir ouch. 82 ouch *fehlt in* P B. 85 solt'] P B der solte; an der vart] B an die fart. 86 gotes *fehlt in* P B. 87 da] P B do; wurden] P wurdent B woren. 88 *fehlt in* P B D. 89 daz] B des; nit] P niht B nicht. 90 Satenase] P Sathenas B Sathanas. 91 er] P B er dar zoch; wise] B wisen. 92 verkert'] P B und bekerte; ver Eva] P frowe eva B in; spise] B spisen. *Hier folgt in rotem Druck bei P:* Dis ist der rat den der tufel Adam und Eva riet do sū in den appfel bissent. B *hat ein Bild von der Versuchung der beiden ersten Menschen mit dem Titel:* Die andere missetat. 93 daz] B do; sie] P Eva B er; eze] B asse. 94 und] P B und do mit; breche] B brache. 95 was *fehlt in* P. 96 jar] P jor; umbe] P B umb. 98 sime] B sinem. 99 gar] P B do gar. 100 gedahte] P gedochte B gedochte; here] P B herre. 101 me] B mer. 102 komen] P kumen. 103 zer] P B zu der; da *fehlt in* P B. 105 geschiet] B geschiede. 106 verkoufte] P verkouffete. 107 hate got verraden] P B got hat verraten. 108 komen] P B wol kumen (B komen); gnaden] B gnoden. 109 schickete] B schuff; im] P ime. 110 zwifelt' an] P verzwürfelte von B verzwürfelte an; barmecheit] P B barmhertzikeit.

- Da mit ich in so sere befig,
 Daz er sich selber erhing.
 Do gedahte ich gar eben,
 Daz im gotes brot inn munt was geben.
 115 Die sele ich im zem buch uz reiz.
 Ich furte sie mit mir, got weiz,
 In daz apgrund der hellen,
 Da hat erz spil mit uns gesellen.
 Ich gibe mich ouch schuldig daz,
 120 Daz ich was by Cayfas
 Und ouch by Pilatus,
 Do sie martelten Jesus.
 Da was mit min rat zû male.
 Mir det we sin quale.
 125 Wer mir der here reht bekant gewesen,
 Ich hete ir keinen lan genesen.
 Ze lest ich riet Pilat daz leit,
 Daz er im selbe die kele absneit.
 Man warf in in den Ziber dot:
 130 So brahte ich in ouch zû uns in die not.
 Dem priester was von engsten heiz,
 Daz im uz brach der sweiz,
 Daz er also vor im saz.
 Der tufel aber sprach furbaz:
 135 'Ich kan dirs nit halp gesagen,
 Waz ich lute han erslagen,

111 da] P do; in] B nun. Nach 112 folgt dann in Rot bei P: Wie sich Judas selber er hing; B fügt ein: Dis ist die dritte bihte, darunter ist das kostliche Bild vom Teufel, welcher Judas die Seele aus dem Leibe reisst. 113 do] B da; gedahte] P D gedohte B gedacht. 114 im] D ime; gotes] D gotz B gottz; inn munt was] D B was in den munt (B mnt); geben] P gegeben. 115 zem] P B zu dem D zu den; vgl. Paul Lehmann, *Studi Medievali*, 1931; W. Creizenach, *P B Beiträge*, II, S. 177 ff. 116 mit mir fehlt in D; got weiz] B gar heis. 117 daz fehlt in D B; apgrund] P apgründe; der] P des. 118 da] P D B do. B zeigt das Bild von Pilatus, der sich die Kehle durchschneidet; der Titel lautet: Dis ist die vierde bihte. 120 Cayfas] D caphias. 121 ouch fehlt in P D B. Vgl. W. Creizenach, *Legenden und Sagen von Pilatus*, P B I, 89 ff. 123 da] P D do; rat] P rate; male] D mal. 124 quale] B qwal B quelle. 125 Und P D B; here] B herren. 126 keinen] B keine; lan] P D nie gelossen B me lossen. 127 ze lest] P das ich zu leste D B als ich zû leste; P riet Pylatus D pilatus riet B pylato riet. 128 selbe] P D B selber; kele] B kelen; absneit] P D abe sneit. Darauf in Rot bei P: Dis ist wie ime pylatus die kele selber abe sneit; D zeigt das Bild des Selbstmörders mit dem Titel: Wie pilatus ym selber die kele abe sneit. 129 Ziber (*Hyperverschiebung für Tiber*) P zifer D B dieffen; P D B also (dot). 130 so] P D B also; brahte] D brohte B brocht; zû uns in die] B in unser. 131 dem] P den; was] fehlt in P, D B wart; engsten heiz] P D B engsten also heis. 132 im] D ime. 133 vor im] D wor ime B for im. 134 aber sprach] P D B sprach aber. 135 kan] D han; nit] P D nüt. 136 lute han erslagen] P lûte han geschicket zu erslahen D lûdes han erschreckt und er slagen B lute han erstecket und erslagen.

- Erdrencket unde han verbrant.’
 [Der priester sprach:] ‘Wie ist ez umb din leben gewant!’
 [Der tufel sprach:] ‘Ich bin ein mensche also du,
 140 So du mich sihst hie sitzen nû.’
 Die stole er umb den hals im warf,
 Der tufel schrey, ’z were im zu scharf,
 Daz er sin stole neme hin.
 Der bihter sprach bald wider in:
 145 ‘Nein, ez ist baz ergangen.
 Du sitzest hie gevangen.
 Ez sy dir liep oder leit,
 Du müst mir sagen die warheit,
 War umb du daher komen bist
 150 Oder waz dir zû mute ist.’
 Der tufel sprach: ‘Nim hin din bant,
 So wil ich dirz sagen zû hant.
 Mag mir aber daz nit geschehen,
 So wil’ch dir doch die warheit jehen.
 155 Ich binz ein armer boser geist
 Und mohte ich die werlde meist
 Geschicken zû nuwen funden
 Und zû totlichen sunden.
 Do neme ich allen schatz nit fur.
 160 Ich satzt’ mich uber die kirch dur
 Und sach, wenn der mensche hin drang,
 Daz er von den sunden stang
 Noch erger denn ein fuler hunt.
 Daz werte schier bitz uf die stunt,

137 erdrencket] B ertrenkent; unde] P D B und; han *fehlt in* P D B. 138 wie *fehlt in* P; D B owe owe wie. *Es folgt bei P in Rot:* Dis ist der rat des tufels also die lute erslagen wurdent. D hat das Bild: *Drei Männer mit Schwertern kämpfen mit drei anderen in gleicher Bewaffnung, mit dem Titel:* Des tufels rat also die lute erslagen werdent. *B zeigt vier kämpfende Ritter und die Überschrift:* Dis ist die vierde (*es sollte die 5. sein, vgl. 118*) biht des tufels. 139 also] D als. 140 so] P also D B als; sihst] P D siest B siehst. 141/2 P D B *haben hier eine andere Fassung:* Wie schiere (B schier) er ime (B im) die stole | Mit starkem (D B starker) walle (B wale) | Umb den hals gewarf (B gewark) | Der tufel schrey lute (B lut schrey) er (D B es) were (D B wer) im (D ein) zu scharpfe (D scharf B scharpf). 143 sin] D B sine; stole] D lant B hant; hin] D weder hin. 144 bald *fehlt in* P D B; wider] B erwidet. 146 hie] P alhie D allhie B als hie. 148 warheit] P D B worheit. 149 daher] P D har B her. 151 sprach *fehlt in* B. 152 dirz] P dir; zû hant] B zehant. 153 daz] P B des; nit] P D nüt. 154 wil’ch] P D B wil ich; warheit] P D B worheit; jehen] P verjehen. 155 boser *fehlt in* P D B. 156 werlde] P welte D B welt; meist] P D B aller meist. 157 nuwen] B ruwen; funden] P B sunden. 159 allen schatz nit] P D B nüt (B nit) allen schatz; fur] D wor. 160 satzt] P satzete D satte (*unverschobene frk. Form*) B saste; kirch] D kirche; dur] B türe. 161 wenn] P wenne D B wan; mensche] P mensch; hin] P hie in. 162 den *fehlt in* P D B sinen. 163 denn] P denne D dan. 164 schier *fehlt in* P D B; bitz] D bis.

- 165 Daz er fur dich, werter priester, kam
 Und dinen truwen rat vernam.
 So wart er siner sunde ein gast,
 Daz er wart luter als ein glas,
 Er wart clarer dan ein golt.
- 170 'Ich wil dir sagen, priester, waz du dūn solt.
 Frag mich zū hant, waz du wilt,
 Wan'z mine gesellen gar sere bevilt,
 (Sie habent mine bihte vernomen)
 Daz durch gnaden willen ich was her komen.'
- 175 Der bihter sprach: 'Waz gnade versihstu dich?'
 Der tufel sprach: 'Sih, ah sih!
 Ich versihe mich der gnade, daz min rat
 Wirt, E daz jungst urteil zergat.
 Funde ich Jesus gūt als ich in liez,
- 180 Wie doch er uns alle verstiez
 Durch unsern grozen ubermūt,
 Doch weiz ich in so bermig und so gūt.
 Siner gute weiz ich also vil,
 Daz ich an im niemer zwifeln wil.'
- 185 Der bihter sprach: 'Nū sage mir
 Die warheit unde nit enhil,
 Wie gūten hastu in gesehen?'
 Der tufel sprach: 'Daz wil'ch dir jehen.
 Als rehte gūt als ich in sach,
- 190 Do in der blinde jude stach
 Mit eime scharfen...sper
 Nach alles sines hertzen ger

165 fur dich, werter] D vor dich vor den B für dich den. 166 dinen] D B sinen; truwen] P D B getriuwen; rat] D rot; vernam] P D B nam. 167 wart] D wirt; er *fehlt in D*; sunde] P D B sünden. 169 clarer] B clorer; dan] P danne D denne; ein] D das. 170 B Ich sage dir priester.... 171 frag] P frage D frage B ffrage. 172 wan'z] P D wanne es B wannes. 173 mine bihte] B miner biht. 174 daz] P D wanne B wan; gnaden] P gnoden B gnade; willen] D wille; ich was her komen] P das her kumen D B was her komen. 175 gnade] D genaden B gnaden; versihstu] P versihstu D ver siestu. 177 versihe] D verseh B versehe; der] P D noch der; gnade] P B gnaden D genaden; daz] B dz noch. 178 wirt] P wurt; E *fehlt in B*; jungst] P B jungeste D Jungste; urteil] D gerichte; zergat] D B er gat. 179 Jesus] B Ihm; gūt als] P D B also gut also (B als). 182 bermig] P D B barmhertzig; so *fehlt in D B*. 183 vil] D wil. 184 *fehlt in P*; im] D B ime; zwifeln] D B gezwifeln. 186 warheit] P D worheit B vorheit; unde] P D und; nit] P D nūt; enhil] P D verhil. 187 gūten] P D B gūt. 188 daz] B ich; wil'ch] P D wil ich E wil; dir] B dirs; jehen] P D B verjehen. 189 als] P also B so; rehte] P B reht; als] P also. 190 der blinde] D B ein blinder. Vgl. K. Burdach, *Der Longinus-Speer in eschatologischem Lichte, Sitzungsber. der preuss. Ak. d. W.*, 1920, ix, S. 294ff. 191 eime] B einem; scharfen] P B scharpfen; sper] B spere. 192 nach] D B noch; ger] B gere.

- Durch sin gebenedietes hertze.
 Er leit gar willeclich den smertze
 195 Und die angestliche not
 Und kos do den bittern tot
 Und doch vergap er'm sine schulde
 Und liez in haben sine hulde.
 So weiz ich siner gute also vil,
 200 Deich armer geist numer an im verzweifeln wil.'
 Der tufel sprach al da zû hant:
 'Nû han ich, bihter, dir bekant.
 Ich wil schiere von dir varn.'
 Der priester sprach: 'Daz wil'ch bewarn.
 205 Wir muzen baz die bihte ziern,
 Dich vorgesezen und absolviern.
 Sag mir: Hastu umb din sunde ruwen,
 Daz du got so wol wilt truwen?'
 Der tufel sprach: 'Desn han ich niht,
 210 Waz umer mir darumb geschiht,
 Wan ez an der schrifte stat,
 Daz kein man gût getan enhat
 Ane gotes helfe. Daz geloubet,
 Priester, der gnaden bin ich beroubet.'
 215 [Der priester sprach:] 'So wil'ch dir doch entslahen den ban,
 Da mit ich lose frouwen und man.'
 Der tufel sprach: 'Nein, ah nein!
 Es wurde unser niemer kein
 An keinen gnaden funden,
 220 Wan daz heil amme tufel was gar verschwunden.'

193 gebenedietes] P gebenedicketes D gebennedigtes B benedictes; hertze] P D B hertz.
 194 willeclich] D wilclich B gewillclich; smertze] D smertzen B smertz. 195 angestliche]
 D engesliche B engestliche. 197 er'm] P er ime D erime B er im; sine] D die. 199 so]
 P D B also; also *fehlt in* D B. 200 deich] P dez ich D B das ich; armer geist *fehlt in* B;
 numer an im] P B an im niemer; verzweifeln] D gezweifeln B zwifeln. 201 al da *fehlt in*
 P D B. 202 bihter *fehlt in* P D B. 203 schiere *fehlt in* P; D nû; B Ich wil dir nun lan
 faren. 204 daz wil'ch] P B das wil ich bas D ich wil dich bas. 205 muzen] P D B
 müssent; baz die bihte] P D B die bihte bas. 206 P D B Ich müß dich vorgesehen (D B
 vor gesezen) und absolvieren (D apsaluieren). 207 sag] P D B sage; din] P D B dine.
 208 truwen] P D B getruwen. 209 desn han] P B dez enhan D den sin. 210 umer
fehlt in P D B. 211 wan ez] P D wanne B wann; an] B in; schrifte] P D geschrift B
 geschrift. 212 daz kein] P D B das nie kein; getan] D B geton; enhat] P D B hat.
 213 ane gotes helfe] P D B one die helfe gottes; geloubet] P globent D geloubent B
 gloubent. 214 der] D dir. 215 wil'ch] P B wil B wil ich; doch *fehlt in* D; entslahen]
 B entslagen; vgl. *Mariengrüsse*, 44, hggb. von Pfeiffer, *Z. f. d. A.*, VIII, S. 274 ff. 216 da]
 P D B do; lose] P D erlose B erlosen. 217 sprach] P sprach lute B schrey lute. 218 es]
 P B so; wurde] D wurde. 219 keinen] B einer; gnaden] P gnade D genoden. 220 wan
fehlt in B; amme] P D B an dem; was gar] P gar waz; verschwunden] P verschwonden.

- Der priester liez die stole uz der hant.
 Der tufel do gar balde verswant.
 Und sint noch vil tufel die daz jehent,
 Daz sie sich hoffenunge versehent,
 225 Daz so gar doch ist verlorn,
 Wan sie hant verdienet gotes zorn.
 Wir sin in der zit der barmeheit:
 Sunder, nû habe ruwen und leit
 Und zwifel nit, daz ist min rat,
 230 Und klagen unse sunde und missetat,
 Den wir's zu rehte pflhtig sin
 Und haben got lieb zû aller zit,
 Der lonet uns gar gutlich
 Und furt uns in sins vater rich.
 235 Daz helfe got uns allen glich. Amen.

A. Closs.

BRISTOL.

221 uz] P sencken us D sencken nider us B nider sencken us. 222 do] B da. 223 vil] P ettlich D wil B etzliche; jehent] P D B verjehent. 224 hoffenunge] P D noch hoffunge B noch uff hoffunge. 225 so gar doch] P doch gar D B doch so gar. 226 *fehlt in* B; hant] P D habent. 227 sin] P D B sinder sint; der *fehlt in* B; barmeheit] P barmhertzikeit D barmhertzigkeit B barmhertzikeyt. 228 ruwen] D ruwe. 229 nit] P D nût; rat] D rot. 230 klagen *fehlt in* B; unse] P D unser B dine. 231 sin] P D B sint. 232 und *fehlt in* D; haben] P habent B hab; P D in unserme (D unserm) hertzen zû aller zit. 233 gar *fehlt in* P D B. 234 furt] P D B füret; sins] D sines. 235 helfe got uns] P D helfe (B helff) uns got (B gott).

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENTS OF THE ICELANDIC 'HÓLMGANGA'¹

THERE was one method of settling a feud which Icelandic law permitted until the beginning of the eleventh century (c. 1006–14) which met the oft-recurring difficulty that it was distasteful to the Icelander to pursue his enemy at law rather than to wreak vengeance on him according to the time-honoured principles of private revenge. This was the legal Wager-of-Battle. Holmgang (*hólmgang*) was a compromise between the antagonistic conceptions of private and communal law. On the one hand, it is strife pure and simple, fought out with naked weapons until one combatant gains the victory; on the other hand it is a strife every step of which is regulated by the injunctions of a special etiquette of the duel, the *hólmgöngulög*, or Law of the Wager-of-Battle. Holmgang is the trial of personal worth and the test of physical ability. It is a tribute to the part played by sheer strength in Icelandic life, and a testimony to the practical appreciation of that fact by Icelandic law. It was, therefore, devoid of any suggestion of Ordeal, or judgment by the gods. Ironically enough, it was in the Christian South that trial by Wager-of-Battle was regarded as an appeal to a higher power, the Christian God of Battles, to uphold the right and mark in no uncertain fashion His condemnation of the wrong. Apart from the postulation of a just and omnipotent Deity, Ordeal could not exist, and there is not the slightest evidence in the sagas that Combat was ever regarded as an ordeal during the Söguöld. The clarity of vision, the distrust of ideals, and the cool scepticism so characteristic of the Icelanders saw through the futility of such a pretence. Thor and Odin, Frey and Njord, shared too much the frailty of their human admirers and critics ever to be regarded as the passionless arbitrators of right and wrong, or the Olympian dispensers of an unerring justice. For the Icelander the race was to the swift and the battle to the strong.

¹ References are to chapter, page, and, where necessary, line. The usual abbreviations for the sagas have been used. The editions are: (a) In the *Alt nordische Saga-Bibliothek*, Halle; *Eyrbyggja saga*, Gering, 1897. *Egils saga Skallagrimssonar*, Jónsson, 1894. *Gísla saga Súrssonar*, Jónsson, 1903. *Grettis saga Ásmundarsonar*, Boer, 1900. *Brennu-Njáls saga*, Jónsson, 1908. *Vatnsdæla saga*, Vogt, 1921; (b) In the *Islandinga Sögur*, Reykjavík; *Flóamanna saga*, Ásmundarson, 1898. *Fljótsdæla saga*, Sveinsson, 1921. *Ljósvetninga saga*, Sveinsson, 1921. *Reykðæla saga*, Sveinsson, 1923; (c) Other editions: *Gunnlaugs saga Ormstungu*, Mogk, Halle, 1926. *Kormaks saga*, Möbius, Halle, 1886. *Flateyjarbók*, Christiania, 1860–8. *Heimskringla*, Jónsson, København, 1911. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar*, Jónsson, Reykjavík, 1907. *Edda. Die Lieder des Codex Regius*, Neckel, Heidelberg, 1927.

There is not a single instance in the sagas where either of the parties concerned in a holmgang, or in a challenge to holmgang, shows by word or deed his expectation of, or reliance upon, divine help. On the other hand, instances are frequent where a man, whose cause was just even to the extent of sacredness, either fell before a ruthless foe, or knew only too well that such was his only possible fate. *Gísla*. 1, 2 records that Ari was slain on the holm while fighting to preserve his wife's honour, and other sagas prove that this was a painfully frequent happening¹. The combatants relied absolutely on their strength, their cunning, their ferocity and their weapons. These decided the day, and apart from these the fighters started with every chance equal. The consciousness of a just cause may steel the arm to greater effort, but it cannot wither the strength of the other side. Holmgang was often a test of moral issues, but it was always decided by physical means. Very literally, indeed, the gods helped him who helped himself. Thor was the warrior's god, and not the god of the just. Many of the Vikings trusted neither in Christ nor in the Aesir, but in their own might and main, and still less for these could Combat have the nature of an ordeal. It was a trial of men, not motives. The weaker the man, the less his chance of success. The contemporary outlook is made clear by numerous references to the advantage of the better fighter and the hopelessness of the weak man's case².

At times, it is true, a fighter would have recourse to supernatural and unearthly powers to help him in his contest, either to the external help of witchcraft (*Vatnsd.* 33-4:90; *Korm.* 9:19, 12:27, 22:45ff.), or to his own wizardry or magic (*Flóam.* 17:30; *Gunnl.* 9:13), or berserks-gangr (*Eg.* 64:212), but this can hardly be placed in the same category as divine assistance. We must not confuse superstitious rites with religious ceremonies. In two sagas only, *Korm.* and *Eg.*, is there anything that can be considered as evidence of a religious element in the carrying out of a holmgang, and this is confined to a scanty account of either one or two sacrifices which took place as part of the procedure at the legal Wager-of-Battle. The contest between Egil and Atli took place in Norway, but that does not affect its interest and importance in this connexion. I have brought together their evidence.

¹ *Grett.* 19, 68; 40, 151; *Reykð.* 19, 69; *Flóam.* 15, 24; *Eg.* 64, 212; *Fljótsd.* 33, 139.

² See especially *Grett.* 40, 151; *Vatnsd.* 33, 90; *Eg.* 64, 212; *Ljósv.* 17, 56; *Njála*, 8, 23; 24, 58, and previous references. These conclusions are generally accepted. See, *inter alia*, Dahn, *Fehdegang und Rechtsgang der Germanen*, p. 121; *Studien zur Geschichte der germanischen Gottesurteile*, p. 57: both in *Bausteine*, 1880, II. Maurer, *Altisländisches Strafrecht und Gerichtswesen*, 1910, p. 705. Von Amira, *Grundriss des germanischen Rechts*, 1913, p. 277. *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 1911-19, IV, p. 596.

1. *Korm.* 10:20, 28–33. ‘It was the law of the Wager-of-Battle that the cloak (on which the fighters stood) must be five ells square, and loops at the corners. They should set down pegs with heads on one end. These were called *tiösnur*. He who was carrying this out must go to the *tiösnur* so that the sky could be seen between his legs, holding the lobes of his ears, with the following address (*formála*)... (this has been lost)...and afterwards was performed the sacrifice which is called *tiösnublót*.’

2. (a) *Korm.* 22:47, 1–2. ‘They went to the holm. Thorvard gave the witch a bigger fee, and then he sacrificed.’

(b) *Korm.* 22:47, 29. ‘Kormak saw where a bullock was standing, and hewed at it.’

(c) *Korm.* 22:48, 22–49, 2. ‘Thorvard mended slowly, and as soon as he could get about he went to visit Thordis (the witch) and asked her what was his best remedy. She says, “There is a hillock a short way from here, wherein elves dwell. The bullock which Kormak slew (2 b) thou shalt take, and redden the hillock with the steer’s blood, and make the elves a feast with the meat, and thou shalt get better.” After that they sent word to Kormak that they wished to buy the bullock. He said he was not unwilling to bargain with them, but for it he would have the ring that Steingerd had. They fetched the bullock, and gave Kormak the ring.’

3. *Korm.* 23:49, 32. At the end of his second successful holmgang with Thorvard, ‘Kormak hewed down the sacrificial bullock in the old way (*Kormakr hjó blótnaut eptir siðvenju*), and said....’

4. *Eg.* 65:219, 14–17. ‘There was led forth a bullock big and old. It was called the sacrificial bullock (*blótnaut*). He must hew at it who had the victory. Sometimes there was one beast, sometimes each that went to the holm had his own led forth...(now follows an account of the holmgang, which Egil wins)....’

65:220, 5–8. ‘Egil leapt up quickly, and to where the sacrificial bullock stood. He gripped at its beard with one hand, and at its horns with the other, and twisted so that its feet left the ground and its neck was broken.’

The consideration of these passages is rendered difficult not only by the unknown elements they contain, but also, in the case of *Korm.*, by the very bad state of the text upon which the above translation is based. Some few facts are plain—that it was a custom, at some holmgangs at least, to offer the sacrifice of a bullock to the gods, and that it was part of the *hólmgöngulög* that a sacrifice called *tiösnublót* should be carried

out, apparently at every holmgang. The question which at once arises is whether these two sacrifices are one and the same. Gudbrand Vigfusson and York Powell assume so in their collection of *Primitive Laws and Customs*¹, but to my mind the evidence points the other way.

When did the sacrifice of the *blótmaut* take place? Sacrifice can be either a gift which seeks favour, or a thanksgiving, according to the time at which it was offered. According to 2 *b* and 3 it would be a thank-offering after victory, and according to 4 also, when the victor offered it after his battle. There is nothing in this last passage inconsistent with the idea that only the victor made the sacrifice. The identity of the victor must necessarily remain uncertain until after the event, and so both combatants would have a steer in readiness. In this way they signified their willingness to repay to the gods any favours granted them. That the loser could not, or would not, carry out his first intention is not unnatural, and is certainly in agreement with the Icelandic attitude towards the Aesir.

So far we have been on safe ground, but further progress is possible only by a policy of speculation and deduction. The difficulties presented by 1, 2 *a* and 2 *c* are more awkward. In the first place, the peculiar significance of *tiösnur* has been lost to us. Possibly the address or preamble (*þeim formála*) would have supplied the necessary enlightenment, but the scribe has omitted it from his summary of the *hólmgöngulög*. From its position in the *hólmgöngulög*, it would seem that the *tiösnuþlót* took place before the combat. The order of the regulations seems roughly consecutive—preparation for the holmgang, its conduct, and its results.

The next extract, 2 *a*, even as it stands, states distinctly that Thorvard sacrificed after he had gone to the holm, but before he started to fight. This would seem to correspond to the time of the *tiösnuþlót*. But another factor offers itself for consideration—the faulty state of the text at this point. The few lines of our extract seem dragged into their present context in a glaringly haphazard manner. An illustration is necessary. After the brief and unamplified statement that Thorvard consulted Thordis the spaewife about his chances in the coming holmgang (22:45, 27–9), there follow 27 lines of prose about the dealings of Kormak and Thordis, and then a verse of 8 lines spoken by Kormak. Straight after this comes our quotation, which occupies one and a quarter lines (47, 1–2), and is followed immediately by ‘Kormak quoth the verse... (another verse of 8 lines),’ and then 14 lines of prose and verse dealing with

¹ *Origines Islandicae*, I, 1905, p. 321.

Kormak and Thordis again, before we get an account of the holmgang¹. It is clear that these one and a quarter lines are quite out of place. The text of *Korm.* is bad almost throughout, and we may justifiably regard the position of our extract as a transposition of the careless copier. Their obvious place, indeed, the only place that the coherency of the narrative allows them, is after 'Steingerd declared her wish to go to the holm, and it was so (47, 14-15).' This would supply an additional meaning to the second half of the extract. Kormak has been to Thordis, as well as Thorvard, and so the latter pays her a bigger fee as an inducement to stand by him. A translation of the revised text then reads, 'Steingerd declared her wish to go to the holm, and it was so². They went to the holm. Thorvard gave the witch a bigger fee, and then he sacrificed. After that, they fought. Kormak's sword would not bite. For a long time they dealt blows at each other, but neither sword would bite. At last Kormak hewed at Thorvard's side. That was so mighty a blow that Thorvard reeled under it, and his ribs were broken, and he was out of the fight, and with that they parted. Kormak saw where a bullock was standing, and hewed at it (2 *b*).' Here we have two distinct sacrifices, both on the holm, one before the holmgang, the other after it. The first corresponds to the time of the *tiðsnublót*, it would seem, but the second is absolutely distinct, and cannot be confused with it.

If, as seems reasonable, we can regard these premises as substantially correct, they supply us with some interesting conclusions about the difference between these two varieties of sacrifice. The *tiðsnublót* was a traditional and in part outworn ceremony which originally was part of the proceedings at every strict holmgang, but which had fallen into practical disuse by the time of the Settlement. It may have been nothing more than an emblemistic ritual, a propitiation of the gods, and a commendation of the warrior's soul to Valhalla and Odin³. It is not hard to find parallels for such a proceeding before more general combats⁴.

¹ The text of *Korm.* published at Reykjavik, 1916, in the *Íslendinga Sögur* series, and edited by Sveinsson, keeps the same arrangement as that of Möbius. The statement about Thorvard and Thordis (p. 53) is followed by 35 lines of prose and Kormak's verse: then our extract (55), followed by another verse and another 16 lines about Kormak and Thordis, before the account of the holmgang.

² Kormak's verse here (No. 70) is almost certainly apocryphal. In any case, its omission or insertion does not affect the present contention.

³ 'When Odin was at point of death, he had himself marked with the point of a spear, and dedicated all weapon-slain men to himself' (*Heimskr.*, *Yng.* 9, 9, 12). Hence the later custom to give or dedicate either oneself (when facing death) or one's foe to Odin. Cf. *Yng.* 9, 9, 28; *Völuspá* 24, 1; *Hávamál* 138, 3; *Landn.* 5, 12, 4.

⁴ The 'hazelling of a field' for a holmgang has a parallel in the hazelling or marking out of an appointed battle-field before a general encounter. Thus, there is some other analogy between the preparations for both kinds of fight.

There is a passage in *Flateyjarbók* which says, 'He gave him a reed wand in his hand, and bade him shoot it over Styrbjorn's company, and he must say, "Odin, take you all"' (2, 72). There is a similar incident in *Eyrb.* 'Then Steinthor cast a spear in the old heathen fashion over Snorri's company....' (44:161). The idea of sacrifice is prominent here—the opposing force is marked out as an offering to Odin. On the one hand, it may be urged that it went no further than the usual sacrifice for victory (*sigrblót*). The enemy was proffered as the price of victory. On the other hand, the procedure may have a more ritualistic significance, and be more a convention than a conscious offer of human sacrifice. May it not be that the *tiösnublót* bore the same relation to *hólmganga* as did the dedication to Odin to the pitched battle? Already, by the middle of the tenth century, it was a relic from earlier Norwegian custom and belief, already, since a convention, its meaning was practically lost, and the ceremony itself carried out spasmodically and perfunctorily. Although different sagas give more or less detailed accounts of about twenty-five *holmgangs*, there is no second mention of the *tiösnublót*, not even in those sagas which pretend to quote the *hólmgöngulög*. After the middle of the tenth century, it seems definitely to have lapsed. If extract 2 *a* refers to the *tiösnublót*, it would seem that the sacrifice was carried out by the fighters themselves, which is what we should expect¹. The slaughter of a bullock after the fight was a voluntarily carried-out sacrifice by the victorious party, and its fulfilment depended entirely upon his sense of gratitude for favours received, and hope of benefits to come. This does not argue any suggestion of Ordeal.

There is one further difficulty in our extracts from *Korm*. There must be some way of reconciling the inconsistencies of 2 *b* and 2 *c*. Thorvard's wound was to be cured by virtue of the blood of a bullock which he had to buy from Kormak. This, we are told, was the bullock slain by Kormak in 2 *b*. We are now confronted by a manifest absurdity. In the first place, it seems inconsistent with Kormak's character that he should have bothered to take home the carcase of the bullock he had slain, secondly, it outrages our conceptions of Norse religion and mythology that the blood of this long-dead bullock ('Thorvard mended slowly') should be a fitting libation for the elves from whom Thorvard was to expect help and health, and, thirdly, it seems the height of improbability that Kormak should still have the dead bullock for sale after such a

¹ This peculiar sacrifice, and especially the fantastic approach to the *tiösnur*, has an echo in *Vatnsd.* 26, 71, 21–25, in the antics of the spæwife. Vogt's note suggests that the injunction in the *hólmgöngulög* was to keep evil spirits away from the *holm*. See his references.

long time. We know that living beasts were sacrificed to the gods, and the significance of the choice of a bullock for slaughter is heightened by the following passage in *Gylfaginning*. 'Then Thor turned away to where he saw a herd of oxen, which Hymir owned. He took the biggest ox, which was called *Himinhnjóðr*, and struck off its head, and went with it to the boat' (48:86). This was the bait with which Thor fished up the *Midgardsormr*, and it is not fanciful to see in the slaughter of this sacred beast (*himin-*) some vague, almost uncannily ancient, sacrificial elements. Obviously, then, in 2 c a live bullock is meant, and this throws considerable doubt on the *ok hjó þat* of the preceding extract. Probably, Kormak, dissatisfied with his incomplete victory, begrudged the sacrifice of the animal, and took it back home with him. In any case, the passage would confirm the idea that such sacrifice depended on the will of the sacrificer, and was only rarely practised after *holmgangs*.

The influence of religious conceptions on *hólmganga* was confined to the presence of certain sacrificial elements. These are found but rarely, and do not imply any suggestion of divine intervention, or divine concern for the morality and justice of the case. There were two different forms of sacrifice, the *tiðsmublót* before the fight, and the slaughter of a bullock by the victor after the fight. Both were antiquated survivals, and there is no evidence to show that either lasted till the eleventh century, or even the last years of the tenth.

GWYN JONES.

MANCHESTER.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

NIGEL WIREKER OR WETEKRE?

The earliest evidence for the surname of Nigel, monk of Canterbury and author of the *Speculum Stultorum* and other works, is the title *Nigelli de Longo Campo* written in a contemporary hand on fol. 1 b of MS. Cotton Vesp. D. xix, which contains his *Miracula B.V.M.* and some other poems. The manuscript belonged formerly to Christ Church, Canterbury, where he was monk, and as it is of the thirteenth century, the title is almost contemporary evidence, for Nigel may have survived into that century. It is also usually held that the fact that he addressed a long remonstrance to William de Longchamp, Chancellor and Papal Legate, upon ecclesiastical corruption, and that it is probably the same man whom he addresses as 'Willelme' in the preface to the *Speculum Stultorum* argues a possible kinship between the two. At any rate it seems more likely that Nigel's relationship to the Chancellor should have emboldened him to write the remonstrance than that the title should be 'a simple mistake arising from his connexion with William' (Stubbs, Introduction to *Epistolae Cantuarienses*, Rolls Series, xxxviii, p. lxxxv, n.); Stubbs adds, 'more probably they were relations or fellow-townsmen.' I shall return to this title later.

The name 'Wireker' derives solely from Bale, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum* (ed. by Poole and Bateson, Oxford, 1902, pp. 310, 311), 'Nigellus de Werekere, monachus Cantuariensis,' followed by a list of works which includes a wrong attribution to him of the *Entheticus ad Polieraticum* of John of Salisbury, and at the end of the list, 'ex studio Grimoaldi.' A previous entry attributes some of Nigel's works to 'Nigellus Eliensis monachus,' and the name 'Wireker' has been written over. The name also occurs in Bale's notice of Nigel in *Scriptores Britanniae*, III, 50: 'Nigellus Wireker.' The surname does not occur at all in Leland, while Pits' notice in *De Illustribus Angliae Scriptoribus* is manifestly derived from Bale, for he also makes the wrong attribution of the *Entheticus* to Nigel, both he and Bale calling it by the curious title 'adversus barbariem.' Later bibliographers all follow suit. In MS. Digby 27 there is a note, possibly by Thomas Allen, the owner of the manuscript, 'Nigellus Wireacre est author istius libri,' and an early Catalogue seems to have spelt the name 'Wirechez,' for so it appears in Bernard, *Catal. MSS. Angl. et Hibern.*, Tit. I, P. I, p. 78, 1628.

The only writer to attempt an explanation is Immanuel Weber, in *De Nigello Wirekero*, Leipzig, 1679: from the river Wear (Wirum) in Northumberland, or from Worcester (Wirecestre); neither seems convincing, and Dr Allen Mawer tells me that he cannot recollect any place-name which in any way resembles 'Werekere.'

I suggest that Bale may have misread the name, which should read instead 'Wetekere' or 'Wetekre.' The evidence for this is an entry in the list of contents of MS. Cotton Julius A. vii (fifteenth century): 'versus Nigelli Wetekre monachi Cantuariensis missi ad Willelmum Episcopum Eliensem Richardi primi Cancellarium,' and the same spelling is found in Thomas Smith's Catalogue, date 1696. In the manuscript the title is hardly legible at all, but the words 'monachi Cantuariensis' can be discerned dimly with the naked eye and much more clearly in a photostat; nothing seems to have followed them, but we can hardly doubt that 'versus Nigelli Wetekre' must have preceded them. As the manuscript was damaged in the fire of 1731, the title would have been much more legible when the Catalogue was composed; the list of contents is, I am informed, about contemporary with it. It is less likely, moreover, that anyone should have misread the at that time established name Wreker as Wetekre than that Bale should have made the opposite mistake. It is further a striking coincidence that here too we have the wrong attribution of the *Entheticus* to Nigel, for it is this very poem that constitutes the 'versus' in question; this may have been the very manuscript in Grimald's library; if so, Bale made the double mistake of reading *r* for *t* and inserting an *e* after the *k*.

I suggest further that Nigel derived the name from the hamlet of Whitacre in Kent, near Waltham and in the hundred of Petham. A charter of Lanfranc quoted by Dugdale, *Monasticum Anglicanum*, vi, 615, mentions 'Whetacre' together with other places as given by him 'duobus militibus Nigello et Roberto,' the tithes to go to the Hospital of St Gregory (1070), while in the Red Book of the Exchequer (Rolls Series, p. 725) we find that Willelmus Gallord holds a half fee in 'Watekere' in Kent in 1210-12 among the 'milites Archiepiscopi.' By the reign of Henry III this half fee is held by 'Furmentinus de Wheteacre' (*Kent Fees*, ed. Greenstreet, p. 11), and he occurs frequently in various charters with the place-name spelt Wetekre, Wathakre, Wetehkere, etc. (*Harley Charters*, 77G21, 35; 78B1, 138, E11; 80A35, etc.), together with his brother Reginald; other members of the same family occur, including one Nigellus de Wheteacre, in documents of the next two centuries (*Calendar of Chancery Warrants*, 1299; *Calendar of Inquisitions*,

1320; *Kent Fines Edward II*, 1324; *Placita de Banco*, 1327, p. 252; *Harley Charters*, 78E9; 79A34, B56; 80C46, E10, etc.). I cannot prove the existence of the surname, as connected with the Kent Whitacre, before the thirteenth century, but Alan de Wathacre occurs in Additional Charters 8517 for Suffolk in 1165, and Robert de Witacra in a Pipe Roll for Northants in 1189.

If Nigel was a native of Whitacre in Kent and at the same time a Longchamp, it would seem to be necessary to establish some connexion between the place and that family. The Longchamp family tree has been set out in detail by Miss Agnes Ethel Conway in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xxxvi, 1923, from the father and uncle of the Chancellor downward; its connexion with Kent is confined to the Chancellor's brother Osbert, through his wife Avelina, of Allington Castle, and his descendants. If Nigel's father was a Longchamp, he must have belonged to the generation of Osbert's father Hugh. This is not absolutely excluded, for very little is known about either Hugh or his brother Henry; so far as this country is concerned they are connected with Herefordshire¹. But it must be admitted that the title in MS. Cotton Vesp. D. xix seems to be the sole evidence for Nigel's kinship with the family; a possible link may be found in the lines which he addresses in that manuscript to the memory of a pious lady called Emma: this lady may be the Emma who married Hugh, brother of William the Chancellor, and, after his death in 1195, Walter de Baskerville. And some further support may be found for the theory that Nigel had a Norman father in a couplet which occurs in the verse introduction to the *Contra Curiales*, the remonstrance addressed to his kinsman William (Thomas Wright, *Satirical Poets of the Twelfth Century*, I, p. 151, Rolls Series, LIX). Nigel addresses his book, bound for Ely where William is Bishop; it is to wait till all the crowd has departed and then to approach the great man. Then he goes on:

lingua tamen caveas ne sit materna, sed illa
quam dedit et docuit lingua paterna tibi.

The two languages are probably English and Norman French, those of his mother and father respectively; Latin he would have learnt from neither, but from the monastery school. Further, it is probable that No. 322 of the *Epistolae Cantuarienses* (*op. cit.*, p. 306) is by Nigel; in it are four lines of Latin verse, one of which closely resembles the fourth line of the *Speculum Stultorum*, and compare also the writer's description

¹ I may mention here another of the same name whose connexion with the family is obscure, Radulphus, cleric and scholar, and according to Bale (*Scriptores Britanniae*, xii, 13) an Englishman; he was a boy in 1167, and about 1216 wrote a commentary on the *Anticladianus* of Alan of Lille (see Hauréau in *Notices et Extraits*, xxxiii).

of the Archbishop creeping to the royal court 'gressu formicino immo testudineo' with another line from the *Speculum* (Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 42, l. 15), 'sed pede spondaico gressu gradiens asinino.' Now this letter contains a remark in Norman French, which the writer says that he uttered on the occasion that he is describing. If then Nigel wrote the letter, he knew, and perhaps was proud of his knowledge of Norman French.

As a monk he would be simply Nigel or Nigel Wetekre; it is as Nigellus that he figures in the dispute between the monks and Archbishop Baldwin (*Epistolae Cantuarienses*, pp. 315, 317); further we may compare Holinshed (quoted by Mr Ewen in his recent book *English Surnames*, p. 264): 'among spiritual men it was the fashion to take awaie the father's surname (were it never so worshipful or ancient), and give him for it the name of the town he was borne in,' though Mr Ewen adds that this was not the general practice, and that no general rule was followed. The appearance of the patronymic in the manuscript may mean that that manuscript was itself (or was copied from another manuscript that was) the personal property of the author. The place-name, on the other hand, may have been preserved through a single line of manuscript-descent, or been inserted by a scribe who knew the family; generally, however, knowledge of the author in the Middle Ages, as opposed to that of his work, seems to have died out; no references to him are known. Even the name Nigel has had to be recovered from the manuscripts, for the early printed editions all misread them, and give 'Vigellius,' an error that endured as late as the Wolfenbüttel edition of 1662.

J. H. MOZLEY.

LONDON.

'MELE TYME OF SEINTES,' 'PIERS PLOWMAN,' B, v, 500.

In the B-text of *Piers Plowman* it is stated that at the Crucifixion the sun was darkened 'Aboute mydday whan most ligte is, and mele tyme of seintes.' The two following lines,

Feddest with thi fresche blode owre forfadres in derknesse,
Populus qui ambulabat in tenebris vidit lucem magnam,

connect the passage with the Harrowing of Hell, as set forth in the Gospel of Nicodemus, where Christ, after his death on the cross, came, heralded by a great light, to rescue the patriarchs from their imprisonment. There is also a reference to the legend found in *St Patrick's Purgatory*, that the blessed in the earthly paradise, who have passed through purgatory, and await their call to heaven, are fed once a day

by a light which shines for a short time out of heaven¹. The hour of this refreshment is not stated either in the English verse or in the original Latin prose of the Monk of Saltrey, but the light is obviously a commemoration of that in the Gospel of Nicodemus. The time should therefore be the ninth hour, but the B-text, four lines previously, says that Christ died 'at ful tyme of the daye,' i.e., at mid-day. Similarly, in B, xviii, 59-60, the darkness, which lasted from the sixth hour to the ninth, is said to follow on the death of Christ:

The lorde of lyf and of ligte tho leyed his eyen togideres,
The daye for drede with-drowe, and derke bicam the sonne.

The error probably arose through the change in meaning of the word 'noon,' originally the ninth hour, and used in that sense throughout the Middle Ages, as *N.E.D.* shows, with reference to the Crucifixion. Here it has the effect of ante-dating the 'meal-time of saints' by three hours.

MABEL DAY.

LONDON.

BYRON AND A GREEK MAID.

In the matter of Byron's mistresses scholars have never been quite content to let the dead past bury the dead. Perhaps it is because the game has been unusually exciting, for this modern Don Juan has led his investigators a merry chase over much of Europe and the Near East in their attempts to trace the many ramifications of his love affairs. The lovers were legion, as Byron himself gives us to understand, and no doubt some of his most transient attachments have been unduly emphasised. Although much of his life was given to the society of women, he did not live by women alone. So something of apology and justification is in order before another name is added to the already appallingly long catalogue of Byron's mistresses.

The woman in the case, hitherto unnoticed by English scholars, provides the added interest of having gained the affections of another famous poet, who seems to have been attracted to her mainly because Byron was before him. Furthermore, she inspired a poem which is worthy of the attention of English readers. And finally, there are some facts concerning her alleged connexion with Byron which warrant close study.

The great poet Pushkin, often called the 'Russian Byron,' writes in a letter to his friend P. A. Vyazemsky, sent from Kishinev (a town in

¹ *The South English Legendary*, ed. Horstmann, E.E.T.S., LXXXVII, pp. 216-17.

Bessarabia) in 1823: 'If you go to Odessa in the summer, will you not take in Kishinev on the way? I shall introduce you... to a Greek girl kissed by Byron¹!' At this time Pushkin was a professed admirer of Byron, whose Eastern tales greatly influenced his early romantic poems². Accordingly, it is not difficult to understand why Pushkin found something particularly fascinating in a Greek girl who claimed to have been the mistress of Byron. It is said that Bulwer-Lytton likewise derived a special satisfaction from an affair with a woman whom Byron had previously loved. At any rate, the fact was sufficient to inspire Pushkin's muse, and he wrote a poem in which he declares that this Greek girl may well have been the model for Leila in the *Giaour*³:

To a Greek Girl.

O thou wast born to fan the flare
Of imagination in the bards,—
Him to disquiet and ensnare
With the sparkle of thy warm regards,
With thy strange accents Byzantine,
With thine eyes flashing, crystalline,
And thy foot, small and indiscreet;
O thou wast born for soft retreat,
For passion's ecstasy divine!
Then say: when in his dreams sublime
The bard of Leila would reveal
His own immutable ideal,
Was it not thee he etched in steel,
The poet kind and worn by time?
Or was it on a distant shore
Beneath the sky of Hellas holy
The inspired sufferer knew thee,
Or, seeing thee in dreams before,
He hid thine image in the very
Depths of his heart for evermore?
Perhaps it was with joyous lyre
That the enchanter tempted thee;
A trembling, all unwillingly,
Seized thy ambitious breast entire:
And pressing to his shoulder thou...
No, no, my friend, to feed the fire
Of jealous dreams, I do not vow:
For long was pleasure strange to me;
The very name gives new delight,
But secret sadness of despite
I fear: all that's sweet, false may be⁴.

¹ Пушкин, *Письма*, под ред. Б. Л. Модзалевского (Москва, 1926), т. 1, p. 48.

² For a complete study of this influence see В. Жирмунский, *Байрон и Пушкин* (Ленингр., 1924).

³ Written in 1822 and printed the following year in *Поляная Звезда* (p. 107). The translation approximates as closely as possible to the Russian metre and rhyme scheme.

⁴ Пушкин, под ред. С. А. Венгерова (Спб., 1908), т. 1, p. 141, No. 341.

This would-be prototype for the unfortunate Leila bore the unusual name of Calypso Polychrone. On the uprising of the Greeks against Turkey she had escaped with her mother from Constantinople to Kishinev in 1821. There Pushkin met her and apparently enjoyed her society for almost two years.

Pushkin's love affairs were numerous, and Russian scholars have not been less assiduous than their English confrères intent upon Byron in unearthing information about them¹. Calypso, it appears, was not especially beautiful, but she made up for this lack by possessing a clever intelligence. She was small in stature and quite slender, and her long black hair, large bright eyes, and heavily rouged lips lent an air of voluptuousness to her face, which was otherwise disfigured by a long, hawk-like nose². She had some talent for singing Turkish love songs which greatly pleased Pushkin. Calypso lived with her mother in rather poor circumstances, but she seems to have made her way among some of the best society in Kishinev. The investigators are agreed that Pushkin's love for the girl was not very lasting³, and F. F. Vigel, who was introduced to Calypso and her mother by Pushkin in 1823, writes: 'In him [Pushkin] I did not observe any trace of the loving ardour which he formerly possessed for her⁴.' Vigel describes Calypso as an interesting creature but not very discriminating in the matter of morals. And with some humour he makes a witch out of the mother, relating how she was able to soften the hearts of obdurate lovers by the use of charms⁵.

However, the most curious account of Calypso is that of a Rumanian writer, C. Negruzzi, who claimed to have been much in the company of Pushkin and the Greek courtesan in Kishinev⁶. Negruzzi draws a very romantic picture of Calypso, describing her as a woman of 'angelic beauty,' and quite circumspect in her behaviour and in the choice of her friends. He tells how Pushkin, Calypso, and himself would repair every day to the city gardens where the poet would declaim his verses and translate for them into French. Negruzzi left Kishinev for Moldavia

¹ In his famous 'Don Juan List' Pushkin names a number of his mistresses, among whom is Calypso. Cf. Н. Лернер, *Дон Жуанский Список (Пушкин, Венгерова, iv, p. 88)*.

² Cf. П. Бартепев, 'Пушкин в Южной России' (*Русск. Арх.*, 1866, pp. 1088-1214); 'Из Дневника и Воспоминаний И. П. Липранди' (*Русск. Арх.*, 1866, pp. 1214-84).

³ Cf. П. Бартепев, *op. cit.*, p. 1188; Липранди, *op. cit.*, p. 1246.

⁴ Ф. Ф. Вигель, *Записки*, под ред. С. Я. Штрайха (Москва, 1928), II, p. 237.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 238.

⁶ C. Negruzzi, *Scrierile* (Bucuresci, 1872), I, pp. 217-20. A Russian translation of the Rumanian account may be found in the following: X. С. Киров, 'Пушкинская Гречанка' (*Истор. Вестн.*, 1884, xv, pp. 337-40).

in 1823 and so lost track of his friends. Nevertheless, he completes his narrative with a tale that might well have inspired Byron into a fury of poetic composition had he only known it. He relates how on a dark rainy night in 1824 a travel-worn youth appeared at the gates of a Moldavian monastery. The young man was admitted and later took religious orders. After three years of exemplary life in the monastery the convert died, and on his breast the pious monks found a note with the following inscription: 'In thy great glory, O Lord, hold me worthy, thy sinner and transgressor! Forgive and bless thy sinning Calypso¹!' Then Negruzzi concludes with the statement that the skull of the beautiful Greek girl may still be seen in the catacombs of the monastery.

In this instance, Negruzzi appears to have been indulging in a little romantic foolery, a fact which seems to have escaped the Russian scholars who have repeated his story about Calypso. Although he represents Calypso, disguised as a young man, as appearing at the monastery in 1824, we find a friend of Pushkin, N. S. Aleksev, writing to the poet from Kishinev in 1826, and telling him that Calypso is still there but has fallen into consumption².

The alleged connexion between Calypso and Byron seems to have been generally accepted by Pushkin and the Russian scholars who have investigated the matter. Pushkin represents her as having been 'kissed by Byron,' and in his poem he suggests a definite relationship between them. Vigel notes that 'she had first known love in the embraces of Lord Byron³'; Bartenev writes that 'her connexion with Byron undoubtedly added to Calypso a special allurements in the eyes of the poet⁴'; and other investigators make similar statements⁵. Even the most recent editor of Pushkin's letters, B. L. Modzalevsky, writes: 'About her they have related that she was once the sweetheart of Byron⁶.'

Nevertheless, the fact must not be overlooked that her relationship

¹ C. Negruzzi, I, p. 220.

² See the notes of Modzalevsky (Пушкин, *Письма*, II, p. 211). Pushkin answered this letter of Aleksev and refers to Calypso (*Письма*, II, p. 22).

³ *Записки*, II, p. 237.

⁴ П. Бартев, *op. cit.*, p. 1188.

⁵ Cf. X. С. Кирков, *op. cit.*, p. 337, 'She could hardly have been the object of love from Pushkin, who was attracted to her, perhaps, by the tale that Calypso had been the mistress of Byron'; 'Пушкин в Кишиневе' (*Русск. Арх.*, 1899, VI, p. 348, перепечатано из *Моск. Ведом.*), 'Although she was called "charming," she was, however, more than ugly, and Pushkin was attracted to her only because he believed that she had been loved by Byron.' Cf. also *Соч. Пушкина*, под ред. А. Е. Ефремова (Москва, 1882), I, p. 529; *Пушкин*, Венгеров, II, p. 600, and II, p. 167; VI, p. 88.

⁶ *Письма*, I, p. 268.

with Byron rests ultimately on the assertion of Calypso herself. There is no reference to her in any of Byron's letters or journals, nor do Moore, Hobhouse, or any of the English, French, and German writers on Byron, as far as I can ascertain, mention Calypso. But this lack of solid evidence, of course, would not necessarily prove that he did not meet her. Though he could hardly boast with Pushkin that 'plus ou moins j'ai été amoureux de toutes les jolies femmes que j'ai connues,' Byron no doubt loved many women who were denied the immortality of any mention in his letters or poems.

If Calypso did meet Byron, there remains the question of where and when. Vigel, writing of the year 1823, notes that Calypso had known Byron 'five years ago when he was travelling in Greece¹.' Obviously this is a misstatement, for Byron was in Italy in 1818. Yet Pushkin, too, seems to be under the impression in his poem that it was 'Beneath the sky of Hellas holy' that Byron had met Calypso². On the other hand, one Russian investigator makes the statement that Calypso was the mistress of Byron when he lived in Constantinople³. If this were the case, the year of the meeting must have been 1810 when Byron spent some two months in the Turkish capital. Negruzzi, however, affirms that Calypso was only eighteen years old when Pushkin met her in Kishinev in 1822⁴, and this of course would make her six years of age in 1810. But we have already found Negruzzi untrustworthy in his reminiscences, and even if eighteen was her own representation of her age to him in 1822, some allowance must be made for the traditional feminine coyness in the matter of age. We know definitely that she lived in Constantinople, and if she had ever met Byron, this would have been the most likely place. Granting that Calypso must have been quite young in 1810, yet we should remember that not one of the three Macri

¹ *Записки*, II, p. 237.

² The possibility that Byron knew Calypso in Greece suggests at once that she may have been the 'maid' in the 'Fair Maid of Athens.' But there is no positive evidence to support this idea, and there is more likelihood, as editors have always believed, that Teresa Macri inspired this poem. Then there is also the possibility that Calypso was the nameless girl whom Byron is supposed to have saved in Athens. This supposition is particularly attractive since the intended fate of this girl—to be sewn in a sack and thrown into the sea—was the fate of Leila with whom Pushkin identifies Calypso. But this whole adventure of Byron is shrouded in mystery, and there is not a shred of evidence to support any such identification. Besides, according to Medwin, the girl Byron saved was Turkish, and died shortly after. Cf. T. Medwin, *Conversations of Lord Byron* (London, 1832), pp. 114-17; E. C. Mayne, *Lord Byron* (N.Y., 1926), pp. 121-2.

³ А. Яцимирский, 'Пушкин в Бессарабии' (*Пушкин*, Венгерова, II, p. 167). He writes that Calypso attracted Pushkin 'not so much by her Greek and Turkish ballads as by some obscure intimation that she had been the mistress of Byron himself when he lived in Constantinople.'

⁴ Negruzzi, I, p. 218.

sisters of Athens, for whom Byron protested his passionate love, had reached the age of fifteen¹.

The reference to Leila in Pushkin's poem is interesting. But there is nothing in Byron's description of Leila that would lead us to suppose that Calypso was the original of the Giaour's unhappy loved one. No doubt the name of Leila occurred to Pushkin simply because at the time of writing his poem (1821) he had been reading the *Giaour* with the view of translating it into French².

Obviously, with the evidence available, it is impossible to prove conclusively that Calypso Polychrone met Byron. But it is certain that Pushkin's infatuation for her was prompted more or less by the belief that she had once been the mistress of Byron, and this fact provided the inspiration for his poem. The problem whether or not Calypso knew Byron may remain unsolved, but the whole affair furnishes additional evidence of the pervasive influence of the English poet before his death, even in far-off Bessarabia.

ERNEST J. SIMMONS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

¹ Cf. Byron, *Letters and Journals*, ed. R. E. Prothero (London, 1898), I, p. 269.

² Cf. Н. Козмин, 'Пушкин о Байроне' (*Пушкин в мировой литературе* [Москва, 1926], p. 102).

REVIEWS

The Proverbs of Alfred, Studied in the Light of the Recently Discovered Maidstone Manuscript. By HELEN PENNOCK SOUTH. New York: New York University Press. 1931. viii + 168 pp.

Dr South has printed the text of the Maidstone MS. of the *Proverbs*, supplementing it where defective (1) by Wanley's transcript of the fragment of Cotton Galba, and where that fails (2) by Hearne's transcript of Spelman's copy, and (3) by the text of the Trinity MS. in that order. She claims that thus the text 'in each of its sections offers the most authoritative representation of the archetype.' In addition she gives parallel with the text in the relative place James's selections from Allen's transcript of Cotton Galba, and in the footnotes she records Spelman's evidence besides select readings from the Trinity and Jesus MSS. It is a pleasure to have the Maidstone MS. in this handsome and convenient form, and it is useful to have with it the other material, some not readily accessible, though it is regrettable that Spelman's evidence was not given in full. There is moreover a glossary and an introduction in which several of the problems connected with the poem are discussed in a careful and interesting manner. The book is altogether a welcome and valuable aid to the study of the text and, whether one accepts or rejects Dr South's conclusions, a useful addition to the literature of the subject.

The introduction discusses the manuscripts and their relations, the identification of *Sif(f)orde*, *Seuorde*, literary references and parallels, and attempts to determine the dialect by the application of linguistic tests. On the first point Dr South rightly concludes that T is inferior to C and M, M she thinks may be a copy of C or of some manuscript not far removed, and C either the archetype itself or very little later. Her linguistic investigation thus depends on the assumption, echoed from Carleton Brown, that her text is essentially identical with the archetype, at least so far as based on CM, and it stands or falls with that assumption. This view cannot be allowed, nor can the implicit rejection *a limine* of J's unsupported testimony be admitted. The scribe of J is reasonably careful and trustworthy, not suffering from any 'editorial itch,' and if the text has been tampered with extensively it was clearly not by him. It is also moderately clear that his text derives from a manuscript little if any later than C. But Dr South seems really to be misled by trusting to a sort of majority verdict. She does not realise the consequences of the fact, which she accepts and which it would be quite easy to prove, that CMT are descended from a common original. She believes C was that original but the divergences of T and of M, so far as it is possible to judge, from C forbid the possibility of their being copies of that manuscript. On the other hand, J clearly represents a different tradition. It is not a matter of counting heads, for in CMT we have not three witnesses to the archetypal reading but one witness, the witness of their common source. We have to balance

one tradition against another. Now it is equally clear that of C M T none reflects the original perfectly, and their divergences are of vital importance. J agrees in different parts with each in turn against the other or other two, and its support is decisive. Moreover several of J's unsupported readings bear the marks of authenticity and are superior to the common reading of the other three. Putting entirely aside the problem whether it is or is not an inferior tradition, no attempt to restore the archetype can ignore the evidence of J. The evidence must be weighed in its entirety, for even the unsupported deviations of T from C M occasionally point to the true solution. Further, as it will prove impossible to restore the archetype with any approximation to certainty, its dialect and date are really incapable of exact determination though it may be surmised that it goes back deep into the twelfth century. Dr South's carefully compiled linguistic analysis is thus of value only for the individual manuscripts.

As to the identification of *Siforde* Dr South argues strongly in favour of Shefford in Berks., and she has collected some interesting material showing Alfred's association with the district. She may be right, but the problem is not so simple as she makes it. The early spellings, e.g. Domesday *Siford*, agreeing with that in the poem really prove nothing, and the author does not seem to distinguish adequately here and elsewhere between mere orthographic variants—she refers to *sal* as a Northern form. But Dr South should be well aware that *sal* in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is not a Northern form and that the spelling of O.E. words in *sc* varies even in Domesday. It may also be noted as possibly of significance that MS. C seems to write *sc* for *sh* regularly, but not in the place-name.

The explanations in the glossary follow the lines of previous editors closely, and in difficult cases, where the matter is doubtful, are reasonable. This is not the place to discuss difficult points, and it may be noted merely that *leche* (l. 259) is probably 'leech,' that *forcuþ* and *forfare* have probably their more ordinary sense, 'worthless' or 'infamous,' and 'perish,' that *wan* is rather 'livid,' and *suhþ* (l. 256) rather 'soaks' or 'oozes' and scarcely from O.E. *sūcan*. The quantity of the O.E. words is occasionally omitted, and there are some slips in the forms themselves, e.g., *fēlian* (for *fēlan*), *heregung* for *heregang*, or is *herg(c)ung* meant? *Bopen*, *fro*, *heben* should not have been explained as O.E., *egleche* is rather from *æglæca* (not *āglæca*) *atgo* from **ætgan* (not *āgān*), *lone* is at all events not from O.E. *læn*, and *myltan* is not the same verb as *mettan* (intrans.) though the two were confused in M.E. What is the O.E. *as* cited under *hes* pronoun, and is there an O.E. *frōf(e)rian*?

RITCHIE GIRVAN.

GLASGOW.

Death and Liffe. A Mediæval Alliterative Debate Poem in a Seventeenth Century Version. Edited by SIR ISRAEL GOLLANZ. (*Select Early English Poems*, No. V.) London: Oxford University Press. 1930. xvi + 38 pp. 5s.

In a prefatory note to this posthumous work Dr Mabel Day writes: 'It is my sad duty to perform the last act of a friendship which has lasted for some twenty years in passing for press the book on which, by a tragic suitability, Sir Israel Gollancz was working up to the time of his death. I have supplied a Preface; otherwise the book may be taken to be as he meant to print it.' Sir Israel's death in the last week of the last term of his tenure of the Chair of English Language and Literature at King's College, London, came as a great shock to all who knew him, students, colleagues and friends. A leader of his generation in the organisation of the resources of scholarship, he was a man of wide vision and catholic sympathies. His superabundant vitality impressed everyone; and that this should have been so quickly quenched seemed to his friends incredible. He was a man much beloved. He was happiest with children and young people. His students were devoted to him.

The foundations of his scholarship were laid at the City of London School by that great schoolmaster, Edwin Abbott, to whom not only Gollancz, but Sidney Lee, Beeching and many others owed their enthusiasm for serious Shakespearean studies. He proceeded to University College where he had Henry Morley as his teacher, and thence he passed to Christ's College, Cambridge, to become the intimate disciple of W. W. Skeat. Having graduated he returned to assist Ker as Quain Student and Lecturer, and after three years Skeat secured him as his assistant at Cambridge as University Lecturer in English (1896-1906). Among his pupils were Miss Paues, W. W. Greg, R. B. M'Kerrow, Allen Mawer and P. G. Thomas. But already in 1891 he had won the notice of scholars by his edition of *Pearl* which, with his later work in the same field of West-Midland alliterative verse, may be singled out from his numerous publications as that which has left his most distinctive mark on the study of English. *Pearl* was followed by Cynewulf's *Crist* and a volume from the *Exeter Book*; and then came (1894-6) his *Temple Shakespeare*, a remarkable piece of work to have accomplished in two years. His work as editor in these years for the publishing house of Dent may be estimated by an examination of the *Temple Classics*, which, combining attractiveness of form with regard for scholarship, marked a new era in modern book publishing. It was as editor of this series that we first notice Gollancz's remarkable gift for securing the co-operation of distinguished scholars and organising their services. It was to this gift in later years that the country owes the organisation and development of the British Academy. The same gift marked out Gollancz to be the successor of F. J. Furnivall as Director of the Early English Text Society, and founder of the Shakespeare Association.

The rapid succession of publications during the years 1891-1903 was not maintained, but never at any time was he without serious work on hand; and particular reference must be made to the magnificent fac-

simile edition he produced three years ago of the *Cædmon* codex. In 1913 he began an interesting and important series of mediæval alliterative poems, entitled *Select Early English Poems*, with an edition of *Patience* (revised, 1924), following it up with *The Parlement of the Three Ages* (1915), *Winner and Waster* (1920), *Cleanness* (1921), *Pearl* (1921) and *Erkenwald* (1922). It is to this series that the posthumous volume belongs that Dr Day has seen through the press.

Death and Liffe is one of two alliterative poems—the other, *Scotish Feilde*, Gollancz had also in hand—that have survived only in the seventeenth-century transcripts of the Percy Folio. It is a late fourteenth- or early fifteenth-century poem of a type that for thirty years had engaged Sir Israel's assiduous and particular interest. To remove the corruptions of three centuries and, without obscuring the Folio reading, substitute readings justified by alliterative demands and other peculiarities of verse of the same kind and period was a task for which Gollancz was fitted by temperament and training. He nursed his textual problems for years; his readings are not merely a happy shot. Further, he held that it was the duty of the textual expert to arrive at the poet's meaning. Few editors of mediæval texts have dared as often as he to translate the texts they edit. 'A translation,' he writes in his edition of *Pearl*, 'which aims at interpreting the original, is to my mind the best form of commentary; at all events it clearly indicates the editor's decision good or bad, in difficult passages.' To illustrate Gollancz's emendations in the text of *Death and Liffe*, and the justification of them set out in his explanatory notes, would protract unnecessarily this valedictory notice. *Life*, in the poem, triumphs over *Death*. It might have been Lady Life who used the words of Hosea (xiii, 14) with which Dr Day closes her Preface:

De manu mortis liberabo eos, de morte redimam eos.
Ero mors tua, O mors.

A. W. REED.

LONDON.

The most marked characteristic of Gollancz's work, alike as scholar and teacher, was his conviction of the continuity running through the whole of English literature. This conviction he shared with his great colleague, W. P. Ker, though he expressed it in a different and individual way; and it gave a unity to Gollancz's work, which without it might have appeared somewhat scattered and fragmentary. The study of Cynewulf, of the fourteenth-century West Midland poets, of Spenser, or of Shakespeare formed, in Gollancz's view, only portions of one great whole. And his fondness for the West Midland poets had its justification in the very special position they occupy as 'documents in genealogy,' to use his own phrase:

In common with Langland, the whole school of West Midland poets represents the backward link in the genealogy of English poetry; that is, they link the age of Chaucer, in spirit as well as in form, to the far-off days before the Conquest.

If Gollancz felt this to be true of the West Midland poets generally, he

felt it to be particularly true of that one among the West Midland poets who was the object of his special devotion:

The poet of *Pearl* was a West Midland poet who sought to blend the spirit of exalted religious aspiration with the beauty, harmony, and picturesqueness of the Romance poets. With one hand, as it were, toward Langland, and one toward Chaucer, he, in a sense, more truly than Chaucer, is the herald of the Elizabethan poets; certainly so, if Spenser is to be regarded as the Elizabethan poet *par excellence*. As the author of *Gawain and the Green Knight*, this West Midland poet is the prophet of *The Faerie Queene*, and stands on the very threshold of modern English poetry, in the fullest sense of the term. . . . In beauty, in technical skill, and in picturesqueness that fourteenth-century poet is the counterpart of Spenser, though the poet of the Renaissance had richer stores of knowledge to draw on.

But (just as in the case of his favourite thesis regarding *The Merchant of Venice*) Gollancz was more ready to argue for this view by the living voice than in print. He made a particularly brilliant statement of it in his Presidential Address to the Philological Society on February 6, 1920, when his hearers passed a resolution asking him either to print his lecture, or at least to deliver it again to a larger audience. Gollancz complied with the second request, and on that occasion a verbatim report was taken of the spoken word, and subsequently printed (*The Middle Ages in the Lineage of English Poetry*, 1921). This pamphlet may be specially commended to all who wish to understand the spirit in which Gollancz worked at the history of English Literature.

R. W. CHAMBERS.

LONDON.

The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe: Poems. Edited by L. C. MARTIN. London: Methuen. 1931. vi + 304 pp. 10s. 6d.

A commentator upon Marlowe's poems has a less interesting task than the editor of any of the plays, since undoubtedly Marlowe's greatest poetry was inspired by the stage; but Professor Martin is to be congratulated on the patience and clarity with which he has mastered a host of minor problems in interpretation. A fully annotated *Hero and Leander* has long been needed, and little is now left for the ingenuity of future editors; if occasionally the comments are somewhat too minutely grammatical, that is the fault of a virtue. The commentary on Chapman's continuation is an even more useful performance, an important invasion of the almost uncharted regions of that tantalising poet. It was also a fruitful idea to compare Marlowe's translation of the *Amores* with some contemporary texts of Ovid, thereby reducing the charge of incompetent scholarship brought against his version. The editor's Introduction contains an adequate summary of relevant facts and versions, together with a judicious but necessarily inconclusive balancing of theories as to the dates of the poems; one wishes, however, that room could have been found for a section on their influence, a theme merely glanced at in the commentary.

Criticism of the text is to be levelled not against the editor of this one volume, but against the general scheme of the edition. For scholars it is a serious fault that a modernised text is provided in order to meet the supposed requirements of the general reader. It is doubtful whether the

sort of person likely to buy an edition otherwise so scholarly would be inconvenienced by the Elizabethan pointing which we are coming more and more to understand and respect. Mr Martin, like his fellow-editors, has done his best within his bounds; 'the punctuation has been slightly influenced by that of the early editions where that seemed to indicate greater speed or a freer rhythmical flow than strictly logical devices of pointing would convey'; nor do the poems suffer so much as the plays from modernisation.

The few textual notes are illuminating. The present writer disagrees with a few departures from the earliest readings. Thus, in

Murder, rape, war, and lust, and treachery,

valuable emphasis is lost by the introduction, for decasyllabic scansion, of the first 'and' absent from the early editions. A similar instance is found in

Played with a boy so lovely fair and kind,

where 'lovely,' not found before the 1629 edition, might well be omitted.

It was wise to follow in the main the *England's Helicon* version of *The Passionate Shepherd*, but since important variants were taken over from *The Passionate Pilgrim*, what seems a flaw in the second stanza might have been avoided by retaining (from *The Passionate Pilgrim*) the usual plural of the verb where *England's Helicon* has

Melodious birds sings madrigals.

It is a weakness of the—fortunately obsolescent—custom of textual eclecticism, that everything there depends upon the personal qualities of the editor. Mr Martin's experience and caution avoid all pitfalls; where differences of opinion may arise they are made possible by the excellence of his critical apparatus.

G. BULLOUGH.

EDINBURGH.

A Dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcraftes, 1593. By GEORGE GIFFORD. With an Introduction by BEATRICE WHITE. *Skiaetheia, or A Shadowe of Truth, in certain Epigrams and Satyres*, 1598. By EVERARD GUILPIN. With an Introduction by G. B. HARRISON. *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Servingmen*, 1598. By I. M. With an Introduction by A. V. JUDGES. *Vicissitudo Rerum, an Elegiacall Poeme*, 1600. By JOHN NORDEN. With an Introduction by D. C. COLLINS. (Shakespeare Association Facsimiles, Nos. 1-4.) For the Shakespeare Association: H. Milford. 1931. 6s. each.

The Shakespeare Association has issued the first four numbers of its new series of facsimile texts of Elizabethan works under the general editorship of Dr G. B. Harrison. They are reproduced by what calls itself the 'Replika' process, evidently some form of photo-lithography, which, considering the price at which it enables the volumes to be issued, must be considered very satisfactory. The result naturally is neither as pleasing nor as reliable as colotype, but given a tolerably clear original it

suffices for most critical purposes, while the cost is, I suppose, not more than a quarter. Such facsimiles must be appreciably cheaper, as they are certainly much easier to produce, than reprints. The present examples are reasonably legible, though the impression is sometimes rather uneven; in one a list of readings is supplied in which the facsimile is defective. I suppose that it is to secure a more uniform appearance that the introductions, instead of being printed from type, have been reproduced by the same process.

In the case of facsimiles a good deal depends upon the selection of the copy to be reproduced. When the original is unique one has of course to make the best one can, sometimes of a bad job. However, none of the present books is unique: the *S.T.C.* records from two to six copies of each, and there are probably others extant. It is a little surprising therefore to observe that in Norden's poem some of the headlines are almost entirely cut away. No doubt it saves both trouble and expense to reproduce from the copy nearest to hand, but I would suggest that the Shakespeare Association will consult its dignity by being a little more particular and even extravagant in this respect.

The introductions vary in interest: there seems some danger of writers growing discursive, which would be a pity in a series such as this; but one is naturally grateful for Mr Judges's remarks on the economics of the Elizabethan household. It might be helpful if the biographical information concerning the writer and the bibliographical information concerning his book were given in a more systematic manner, and the latter somewhat amplified. There seems to be no statement as to whether any of these works were entered in the Stationers' Register. (Nos. 2 and 3 were entered, and there is a later transfer of No. 1.) Writers could then be left to add what they thought necessary regarding the significance of the book. There is little in the present introductions that calls for comment. Miss White duly records that Gifford, a nonconformist who refused subscription to the articles, was deprived of his living at Maldon, Essex, and subsequently of his licence as 'lecturer' in 1587, but continued his puritan activities. Considering that the Bishop of London was his particular persecutor it seems strange that he should have preached at Paul's Cross in 1591, though it is so stated in the *D.N.B.* Dr Harrison by a slip gives Bishop Hall's Christian name as John. And is it certain that the Chamberlain's men left the Theatre in April 1597, or correct to say that they ever had a lease of it?

Dr Harrison and the Shakespeare Association are to be congratulated on the inauguration of a series to the further instalments of which all who are interested in the byways of Elizabethan literature and the 'social background' of Shakespeare's work will look forward with unusual interest.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. HERFORD and PERCY SIMPSON. Vol. IV. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. xvi + 620 pp. 29 illustrations. 21s.

This monument of scholarship goes up steadily, storey by storey. The plays in the new volume are *Cynthia's Revels*, *Poetaster*, *Sejanus*, and *Eastward Ho*. The remark on p. xiv applies to the first three: 'To ensure an accurate text every available copy has been collated for those plays which were printed for the first time in Quarto and revised by Jonson in the Folio of 1616.' The skill and labour implied in this sentence are plainly such that few persons are competent to praise them with authority—the present writer least of all. But Mr Simpson's editing and commenting have been already acclaimed by the reception of vol. III. The textual questions and apparatus are here even more complicated, not least in the case of *Cynthia's Revels*; witness, for example, the list that is given (p. 5) of the variants in 'the five copies of the Quartos.' As to *Eastward Ho* (since Jonson's share in it is of the haziest, resting only on the evidence of style), the play is to be excluded from the review, due in a future volume, of his acknowledged work. None the less, the editor sets down (pp. 490 ff.) the mass of corrections embodied in a Quarto 'while it was passing through the press.' The reader may be reminded (from the preface to vol. III) that this review and commentary, and the 'critical introduction to the text as a whole,' will come in the final three volumes; the three preceding will give the remainder of the works. Total, a majestic ten, to the rounding off of which every student will look forward. Two details of interest should be mentioned. 'A unique feature' of the Huntington copy of *Cynthia's Revels* is a leaf of dedication to William Camden, *Alumnus olim, Aeternum amicus*; and this is duly given (pp. 4–5). In *Sejanus* examples are noted, and fully discussed, of the apostrophe mark indicating 'an extra syllable lightly sounded in the movement of the line' (pp. 338–42); as in 'You carry things too—let me borrow' a man.' Instances are added of the same practice, 'much freer,' in Donne. The illustrations are facsimiles, or photographs, of the title-pages of the plays; and the frontispiece is a photograph of that of the 1616 *Works*.

Mr Simpson's labours, as all know, have not in the least been limited to these two volumes or to editorial *expertise*. In the preface to vol. I the nature of the partnership is fully explained. We know what separate portions are due to each scholar, and how they co-operated in the 900 and more pages devoted to 'the man and his work.' These were planned and written by the late Dr Herford, while the material incorporated in them 'has been enlarged at very many points by investigations and discoveries due solely to the editor of the commentary'—a sentence, it is fair to guess, prompted by Herford's unfailing sense of equity. The alliance is beautifully commemorated now in a short *In Memoriam* (pp. xi–xiii). Mr Simpson recalls the inception of the work in 1902, its inevitably slow advance, and the aid that Herford's pages have afforded him in his own special task. He speaks of his friend's scope of mind and critical discernment and of the affection that he inspired. 'To know him—and I may add without hyperbole, to love him, was a liberal education.'

As my sentiment is the same, and as I knew Herford for a generation, I respond to the Editor's kind proposal that I should add a postscript. I doubt whether Herford has yet had his due, even from the learned world. Probably he was best appreciated in Wales and in Lancashire, where he spent his working life, training and inspiring many scholars, and also leaving his mark on the educated public. Much of his work is of course familiar to all who are concerned with English studies. But it ranges far beyond these studies, and is greatly diversified. It would be an apt and graceful service in some young scholar to make a bibliography of Herford's writings. It would then be realised, as it at present is not, how much he did, how well he did it, and how few are likely to accompany Herford's mind over its whole field of interest. The ten volumes of his *Eversley Shakespeare* are an admirable and trustworthy companion. Probably his contribution to the *Ben Jonson*, and *The Age of Wordsworth*, will remain the two chief pillars of his reputation. Neither of them needs praise in this review. *The Age of Wordsworth*, though some of it is hard reading for young students, can hardly, on its own scale, be superseded either as an historical survey or as a series of judgments. As a critic, Herford was very scrupulous, and did not spare shoddy or prejudiced work. If he had a fault, it was a certain over-kindness in judging his contemporaries. Some of us have had cause to blush over his generous inclination to take the will for the deed. He was tender in wording the reserves which his conscience forced him to declare. But this implied a quality uncommon in reviewers; I mean, that Herford would always see, and would clearly state, what his author was *after*; he did not merely sit in a tribunal.

His equipment and habit of mind led him to a catholic, we may say to an European, view of literature. He had been bracketed eighth classic; in his later years he wrote a luminous paper on Lucretius. His ties, intellectual as well as personal, with Germany were very strong. In early days his English style could be too severe, too German and condensed. It became, with time, much lighter and easier. His study of the literary relations of the two countries in the sixteenth century, a real piece of digging, is not, so far as I know, out of date; only last year I heard it eulogised in Harvard. He gave a Taylorian Lecture on 'Goethe's Italian Journey.' His verse translations of Ibsen still hold their ground; they are very skilful and lively. His penetrating paper on D'Annunzio shows his conversance with Italian letters, though he did not profess to be a scholar in that field. He studied Russian; he studied Old Norse. Many of his best articles came out in the *Bulletin* of the Rylands Library in Manchester. But the catalogue need not be continued. On the whole, though sensitive to form, Herford seems to have cared more for the ideal side and the intellectual substance of fine literature. His book on Browning illustrates this preference, which is in accord with what we know of his speculative attitude. He had no little sympathy with the 'religion of humanity,' and I have known few men with more of it in his composition. The obituary notice in the *Times* referred, very justly, to Herford's passionate interest in public affairs. He hated oppression, he was always for the under-dog (for instance, the German minority in Italy); and he always spoke out.

His simple and arduous life shows a fine consistency; and he never failed in nobility of outlook.

OLIVER ELTON.

OXFORD.

English Devotional Literature (Prose), 1600–1640. By HELEN C. WHITE.
(*University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*. No. 29.)
Madison. 1931. 307 pp. \$ 2.50.

The writer of this book is to be congratulated upon the taste and skill with which she has treated a difficult subject and upon the wealth of new material which she has brought to light. During the seventeenth century religious exercise afforded spiritual solace to many who would now seek refuge in science, philosophy or psychology, and the manual of prayer or meditation was the normal medium of individual self-expression. Consequently the type of literature represented by Bayly's *Practise of Pietie* and Dent's *Plaine Man's Path-way to Heaven*—two isolated specimens which Bunyan saved from oblivion—bears an intimate relation with contemporary sermons, homilies and 'divine poems.'

Miss White's introductory survey of the background to this literature, though somewhat disproportionate to the main field of her investigation, has led her to important conclusions regarding the religious tenets of the age and the influence of Catholic devotional writers, including English Recusants. Lacking resources of their own, as Robert Parsons pertinently reminded Edmund Bunny, Protestants were compelled to draw upon those of their opponents. But their conception of faith and of the inner life is ethical and utilitarian rather than mystical; 'and the substitution of Parsons' point of view for Bunny's is really the story of one of the most interesting things that happened in the English Church in those very interesting years from 1600 to 1640.' Upon this subject, to which Miss White has devoted one of the most important sections of her book, she is peculiarly qualified to speak as a specialist at once sympathetic and impartial. The dangerous implications of tenets in vogue among some of the earlier sects such as the Family of Love would account for the distrust of enthusiasm, and this reaction is reflected in the great bulk of devotional literature. For though the term 'mystical' is often loosely applied to the writings of this age its religious manuals show hardly any trace of a genuine spirit of mysticism either in faith, dogma or practice. Notwithstanding the scholastic thought of many writers and their familiarity with religious texts of the Middle Ages, consistent association of the eternal with the topical tends to stifle all sense of the mystery and of the immanence of God. The Saviour of William Cowper's *Most Comfortable and Christian Doctrine* is completely overshadowed by an avenging Jehovah, 'painfully on the moral alert.'

There is beauty, apart from mere quaintness, within these pious handbooks; and the irreverent reader, if not edified, will be diverted by such passages as Richard Rogers' 'Godly Meditation... at our going to Bed' (p. 211) or Michael Spark's 'Morning Prayer for Monday' (p. 175). But Miss White has had to traverse many arid tracts to discover these oases;

and grateful as we may be for the discovery it is doubtful whether the labour was justified in its results. For to posterity the interest of the private prayer-book, like that of the letter, depends upon its relation to its author and to the general literature of his age. There is nothing in this volume to show that such works of this type as deserve to be called literature are sufficiently distinctive to form a class of their own. All that can be done is to classify them as a whole under such heads as 'Methods,' 'Controlling ideas' and so forth. This Miss White has done, and her critical classification is valuable. But it is to be feared that most readers will treat her study mainly as a work of reference, that they will fish rather than bathe. Her admirable chapter upon the Masterpieces makes one regret the catholicity of her choice, which has prevented her from devoting more detailed attention to the finer specimens at her disposal and to the significance of the devotional manual in seventeenth-century literature.

The printing of the book is unworthy of its content. Several errors (pp. 29, 127, etc.) escaped the notice of the proof-reader. The type is bad in many places; in the copy before me p. 259 is partly and p. 270 wholly illegible.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost, Book I. Edited by HELEN DARBISHIRE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1930. xlvii + 38 + 74 pp. 30s.

It is astonishing that the unique manuscript of *Paradise Lost* should not previously have been made available to students of Milton or even properly examined; but if we have had to wait long for this to be done, it has now been done as well as it could be. This volume contains a fine reproduction of the manuscript in collotype, a transcript of it with the text of the first edition *en face*, and an introduction and notes in which the characteristics and value of the manuscript are clearly set forth and ably discussed. We have to thank Mr Pierpont Morgan, to whom the manuscript belongs, for allowing it to be brought back to this country and deposited for two years in the Bodleian; but above all we have to thank Miss Darbishire for removing a standing reproach against English scholarship, and for taking the first step towards a critical edition of *Paradise Lost*.

The history of the manuscript is a painful story. Tradition says that it was used in setting up the first edition of the poem, and there is ample evidence—including the marks of the corrector or proof-reader—to confirm this. On the verso of the first folio is the licenser's imprimatur, endorsed by the warden and clerk of the Stationers' Company; and it was evidently on account of the imprimatur, as Jacob Tonson remarked, that this first book of the manuscript was alone preserved, being passed down from one bookseller to another along with the rights in the poem. It went from Samuel Symons to Brabazon Aylmer, and then to the first Jacob Tonson, from whom we get our earliest news of it. In a letter provoked

by the publication in 1732 of Bentley's 'revised' edition, Tonson tells his correspondent—probably his nephew and successor—that the Doctor's theories and emendations can be refuted by simply looking at the manuscript, which he sends along and of which he at the same time relates the history. The manuscript was in the possession of the second Jacob Tonson at his death in 1737, when it passed to the third Jacob Tonson. The first mention of the manuscript by Milton's editors occurs in 1749, when Newton, in the preface to his edition of *Paradise Lost*, states that it is 'in the hands of Mr Tonson the bookseller'; yet Newton apparently made no effort to see it. Capel Lofft, in the preface to his edition of the first book of *Paradise Lost* (1792), is the only editor in the eighteenth century to notice Newton's discovery; and the next reference is in Mitford's *Life of Milton* (1841), where Lofft is quoted in a footnote. Lofft says he can learn of no other manuscript than that spoken of by Newton, adding strangely 'but where even this is to be seen is not mentioned.' Actually it had been inherited in 1772 by William Baker, grandson of the third Jacob Tonson. Leigh Sotheby located it at the Bakers' house at Bayfordbury, Hertfordshire, and was the first to take action in the matter; he went so far as to examine the manuscript and to reproduce in facsimile the first page and a portion of another in his *Ramblings in Elucidation of Milton's Autograph* (1861). He observes that 'it is very remarkable that Bishop Newton is the only biographer of the Poet who records the existence of [this] very interesting Manuscript...It appears extraordinary, that subsequent editors and biographers of the Poet,—men distinguished in literature for their indefatigable industry and research,—should not have sought out the present location of the said Manuscript.' It is still more extraordinary that even after this editors should not have consulted the manuscript. The only reference in Masson's edition of the *Poetical Works* is a footnote in his introduction referring us to Leigh Sotheby; other editors, including Aldis Wright and Beeching, make no mention of it. In January 1904 Henry Clinton Baker offered it for sale at Sotheby's, but it did not reach the reserve price of £5000: it was then that Mr Pierpont Morgan bought it.

The neglect of this document might be thought a freak of Milton scholarship; but, sad to say, it is typical of the attitude of Milton's editors to the text of his poems. Professor Garrod observed in 1926 (*Essays and Studies*, XII) that it is one of the paradoxes of our scholarship that we have no critical edition of Milton, setting out the variants of the manuscripts and of the editions printed in his lifetime. In all the editions of *Paradise Lost* during the last two hundred years nowhere can the student find the variants of the first two editions, though these were carefully supervised by Milton and are universally claimed by his editors as the authentic basis of their texts. Capel Lofft attempted the task, but did not get beyond the first four books. Beeching reprints the first edition of 1667 and claims that 'all the variants in the second, not being simple misprints, have been recorded in the notes'; but the reprint is not reliable and he records only the rare verbal variants. The texts offered by other editors, even Aldis Wright, are amalgams in which, judging from the

apparatus criticus, more respect is paid to the conjectures of Milton's editors than to his own editions. We are told, however, that the Columbia edition of Milton, now in process of publication in America, will at last give us a reprint of the second (1674) edition of *Paradise Lost* with all the variant readings of the earlier issues.

The main question is what aid our manuscript will be in preparing a critical text of *Paradise Lost*. It was a fair copy made for the press and, as Miss Darbishire argues, there must have been one or more intervening copies, with revisions and corrections, between the rough drafts of the original dictations and this evenly written final transcript. This fair copy was then evidently read over to Milton and corrected at his dictation; Miss Darbishire detects four different hands in these corrections, besides that of the original copyist. The manuscript thus leaves us in no doubt of Milton's efforts to procure a scrupulously accurate text; yet it is inconceivable that every comma and letter should have been read out to him, and a certain number of errors, chiefly in spelling and punctuation, remain. Moreover (O ghost of Bentley's nefarious editor!), the correctors might occasionally alter on their own responsibility; Miss Darbishire argues neatly that the alteration of *capitoll* to *capitall* (l. 756) is such an unauthorised and erroneous correction.

In the case of such a manuscript, several removes from the original, one does not watch the poet 'in his workshop'; in only three places does the manuscript record Milton's first and second thoughts, the most interesting being the change of *many a hunderd pipe* to *many a row of pipes* (l. 709). Moreover, since the text could not be materially altered after being licensed, and since Milton carefully revised the proofs of the first edition, one cannot expect many verbal differences between the manuscript and the printed text. Of seven such differences, three point to correction in proof, and in the other four the manuscript offers a better reading than the first edition. All this amounts to no great catch, though it is not so negligible as to excuse editors' indifference to the manuscript. When we come to the spelling and punctuation, however, the material grows abundant.

On every page of the manuscript the spelling of some word has been corrected. Nevertheless, there remain some of the scribe's own old-fashioned spellings; these the printer clears away, but he had the delicate task of discriminating between them and Milton's own spellings. In Book I he is finding his way; he fails to reproduce some Miltonic spellings and has difficulty with Milton's distinction between the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns. After Book I, however, he succeeds in keeping very close to Milton's exacting requirements. For instance, in the manuscript of the first Book *thir* occurs 64 times and *their* 5, in the first edition *thir* only 30 times and *their* 39; but in Book II the printer gets *thir* 45 times and *their* 3, and in the rest of the poem *their* only 11 times. It is evident that the printer was acting under Milton's directions and trying to meet his wishes; there are, moreover, corrections by the printer of spellings in the manuscript which could only have been made at Milton's dictation in the proof stage.

Miss Darbishire remarks that to answer fully the question which of the variant spellings of the manuscript should be adopted, 'we should need a more thorough study than any scholar has yet attempted of Milton's spellings throughout his works both in prose and verse.' He had arrived at his system of spelling by gradual stages and, although perhaps never used quite consistently, it was as complete as he cared to make it by the time he prepared *Paradise Lost* for the press. On one point at least—that of the emphatic and unemphatic pronouns—his practice had become so consistent that there are few, if any, places in Book I where, with the variants of our three texts before us, we are in doubt of the spelling: it is significant that Capel Lofft's emendations of these spellings in the first and second editions are almost all confirmed by the manuscript. In all Milton's spellings we can distinguish his two chief aims as being, first to spell phonetically and secondly to mark the right metrical reading. He has taken pains to tell us whether we are to read *me* or *mee*, *their* or *thir*, *Heaven* as a disyllable or *Heav'n* as a monosyllable; that we should pronounce *hunderd*, *perfet*, *rowl*, *sovrán*, *femal*, *facil*, *wardrop*, *fardest*, *covenant*, *prisner*, *disastrous*, *adventrous*. Surely we should not neglect these aids to reading the poet's lines as he meant them to be read. Moreover, Milton's meaning sometimes depends on his spelling, as when he takes advantage of a choice of spellings to distinguish between homophones or diverse senses of the same word. Professor Grierson has shown that the word *blanc* (*Paradise Lost*, III, 48) is descriptive of the nature of Milton's own blindness, and that the usual spelling *blank* injures the sense. The other case, however, quoted by Professor Grierson of such differentiation by spelling—the distinction between *rhyme* and *rime*, first put forward by Richardson and ever since accepted—is now proved by the manuscript to be none of Milton's making.

The punctuation of the manuscript has been as carefully corrected as the spelling; and in punctuation as in spelling the printer has followed his copy with close but not absolute fidelity. Sometimes the printer misses a right bit of pointing, sometimes he corrects what is wrong; and many of the corrections once again argue a careful revision in proof. Milton's attention to the punctuation was dictated by reasons similar to those that made him so careful of his spellings, and calls for equally scrupulous attention on our part. 'The music and meaning of his long metrical paragraphs,' as Miss Darbishire says, 'depended on a close interlocking of grammatical construction with metre. A delicate adjustment of stops was needed, at once to mark the right articulation of the sentence, and the due degrees of metrical pause.' The meaning of many a passage in *Paradise Lost* depends on the punctuation; as, for instance, Book VII, 165-73 (a crucial passage for the intellectual system of the poem), which has been variously punctuated by editors and always without indicating the punctuation of the original editions. Miss Darbishire's discussion of Milton's system of punctuation is as interesting as, though less thorough than, her discussion of his orthography.

The final question put by Miss Darbishire is whether the manuscript supports the authority of the first or second edition. The text for the

second edition of 1674 was certainly revised by Milton: the ten books were now made into twelve, in two places new lines were added, and a few words and phrases were altered. So far as Book I is concerned, the four places noted in the *Errata* of the 1668 impression are corrected, and the unemphatic *thir* is systematically restored; of other changes in spelling and punctuation, some readings are supported by the manuscript, and some, disagreeing with both the manuscript and the first edition, are certainly wrong. In effect, the second edition corrects and revises the first, but introduces in the usual way fresh errors; it must be taken as the basis, but not the sole criterion, of a critical text.

The lessons to be learnt from the manuscript, and the task now awaiting some editor, could not be better put than in Miss Darbishire's concluding words: 'There survive in the text of *Paradise Lost* some of his scribe's spellings and pointings, some of the correctors' and some of the compositors', which a single glance of Milton's eye would have condemned. A wise editor of *Paradise Lost* will prepare himself for his task by an intimate study of the manuscript of Book I, side by side with the two first printed texts. . . . He will base his text upon the second edition, since it embodies the author's latest corrections, but he will purge it of minor errors by a careful collation with the first, and, for the first book, with the manuscript.' Above all, may we be given the variants, to see for ourselves.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

The Pepys Ballads. Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Vol. v, 1689-91, Nos. 254-341; Vol. vi, 1691-3, Nos. 342-427; Vol. vii, 1693-1702, Nos. 428-505. Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press. London: H. Milford. 1931. Each 21s. 6d.

Professor Rollins continues the task of publishing his selection from the Pepys ballads, amounting to over one-third of the collection, with unabated zeal and industry. His unflagging progress, if the ample annotations be taken into account, commands admiration. The first two volumes, published in 1929, were noticed in this review (xxv, p. 198) by the late G. Thorn-Drury, the seventh concludes the reprints, and the eighth will round off the work with indexes to the whole.

The earlier ballads in Samuel Pepys's collection at Magdalene College, Cambridge, were probably brought together by John Selden. Pepys continued the collection, gathering together ballad sheets and broadsides, mainly contemporary, until his death. The whole collection was pasted into five folio volumes. Most of the older ballads are in black letter, those in the fifth volume in what Pepys calls 'ye White Lettr', that is roman and italic type. A curious classification, neither chronological nor historical, was adopted, exemplified in the fifth volume by 'ye following Distribution': 'Tragedy viz^t Murders, Executions, Judgments of God, &c.'; 'State & Times'; 'Love Pleasant'; 'Love Unfortunate'; 'Sea viz^t Love, Hardships, &c., of ye Sailor; Engagements & Victorys, &c.'; 'Various Subjects Mixt. viz^t Romantick Feats, Cheats, Frolicks, Fashions, &c.'

To the editor, therefore, falls the task of scientific arrangement—dating the ballads, relating them to incidents and persons, tracing obscure references, discovering, and this is rarely possible, authors, noting printers and booksellers, and deciding on omissions with a special mindfulness to accessibility in other reprints.

On the ground that the older ballads are both more rare, and of greater interest, Professor Rollins reprinted in his initial volumes all the Pepys ballads anterior to 1640, which do not appear in the *Roxburghe Ballads*, *Bagford Ballads*, and the seventy-three contained in his own *Pepysian Garland*. But this leaves approximately 1400 more ballads in Pepys's folio volumes; and from these he does not profess to offer more than a selection of the more important, interesting, humorous, or able pieces. And few of these, it must be admitted, have any claims as literature, on the whole falling below the earlier standard. Just after Pepys finished collecting, the ballad broadside had a brief revival, in a different character, when it was put to political and occasional purposes by writers like Swift, Pope and Gay. These, however, lie outside the date of the present collection.

The ballads in Professor Rollins's fifth, sixth and seventh volumes cover the years 1689–1702. Many relate to the campaigns of William III in Ireland and Flanders; they are written by unknown and half-educated garreteers for the barely literate, to excite sentiments of patriotism and loyalty, with but little regard to truth or accuracy. Beyond war, politics, religion, and the greater events of the day, there are ballads on love, prodigies, wonders, the hardships of the poor, the crimes of profiteers, the exploits of highwaymen and their pious recantations at the gallows. Apart from admiration for romantic criminals, and the frankly erotic pieces, ballad writers affect a naïve and wholly laudable propriety of sentiment. King William's successes demonstrate the righteousness of Protestantism; the miscarriage of treasonable plots signalises, in commendably vigorous phraseology, 'The Whore of Babylon's Rich Robes turned into a Torn-Placket'; parents are warned by the suicide of an unfortunate young lady not to cross their children in love; the miserly farmer is taught compassion for the poor by a sheaf of corn in his fields, which 'was heard to cry like a young Child'; the charitable yeoman is rewarded with a field of corn where none had been sown; the birth of a calf in Somersetshire 'with a flaunting Commode,' is a portent to women against extravagance in dress; the drunken murderer adjures his fellows to prolong their days by avoiding dissolute courses. A complete absence of imagination and subtlety distinguishes, almost without exception, the mood of every ballad; although two or three satirical pieces on hypocritical religion have some literary talent. It is not often that ballads furnish historical facts of any value; but they are important as psychological documents, reflecting a far cruder and more credulous public, in the mass, than confronts even the cheaper journalism of to-day. Although the issue of ballad sheets has continued to our time, a change, and the emergence of a new public, followed closely upon the stage at which the Pepysian collection ends. The earlier years of the eighteenth century saw a rapid increase in the number of newspapers; and, poor as many were,

they began to supplant the penny broadsides as purveyors of news, politics and morals.

Few ballads belonging to the period covered by the three volumes under review can be assigned to authors. Indeed authors' names become rare after 1640. Only three writers sign any of the pieces here selected by Professor Rollins. John Curtin, a seaman on board the *Edgar*, claims authorship of *The Maiden Sailor*, which tells of a girl who served on shipboard as a lad; Richard Rigby, himself a member of the craft, places his name to *The Shoos-makers Delight* and *The Shoos-makers Triumph*, which show some reading if no talent on his part; and a Thomas Joy wrote *The New and True Touch of the Times*. A few other writers are known. The words of *Royal Courage*, written immediately after the battle of the Boyne, are presumably by Betterton possibly re-touched by Dryden. The first two stanzas of *The Charmin Regent's Wish* and of *The Loyal Statesman* are by D'Urfey. A certain Mr Mumford wrote the first two stanzas of *The Jovial Gallant*. Anne Morcott wrote the words of the popular 'Let Mary live long'; and Sir Charles Sedley composed *The Soldiers Catch*. But in the latter part of the seventeenth century the names of writers were unwanted by the publisher or the public.

The workmanship of the Harvard University Press in producing these volumes can scarcely be over-praised; and the binding style is most attractive. The crude type, rough machining, and blurred impressions of the originals are transformed. To reach this end Professor Rollins has adopted a compromise. The title-heads, frequently lengthy, are reduced to a standard system of black letter, roman and italic, whatever the type of the original. Imprints, notes to tunes, and stanza numberings are also standardised. In the text the italics, capitalisation, spellings and punctuation of the originals are followed; but in the case of black-letter ballads the black letter is reproduced as roman, and the roman as italic type. Text and pointing, frequently the want of the latter, have been carefully followed, avoiding modernisation. Any departures noted have been trifles of no importance. The pointing of the title-heads, for example, which are confessedly an adaptation in type-setting, is not always that of the original; and the use of rotographs, presumably, accounts for a few insignificant variations in the text, scarcely worth remark, were it not that minute idiosyncrasies are, in general, exactly shown, or noted. In the first stanza of *The Royal Salutation* (No. 289), for example, 'to o'er throw' is reprinted as 'to o'erthrow,' and in stanza 8, l. 7 of the same piece the 'w' of 'while,' which is scarcely impressed in the original, should evidently be lower case, not a capital. But small points like these only serve to illustrate the high degree of accuracy observed.

The occasional footnotes Professor Rollins supplies to eccentricities in word or spelling, and his silent emendations, are a little erratic, and sometimes unnecessary. On p. 112 of vol. v there is a note 'King' to 'K. William,' where no reader could fail to understand what 'K.' stood for; and on other pages, in other ballads, where the meaning of 'K.' is as transparent, or obscure, no footnote appears. On p. 286 of vol. vi it seems unnecessary to correct 'sworm' to 'swarm,' with a note, when the

meaning of the word is not in doubt and many other peculiarities of spelling are readily passed. Why not note that on p. 294 of the same volume 'ball' means 'bawl'; on p. 299 that 'decent' means 'descent'; on p. 328 that 'better' stands for 'bitter'; on p. 317 that 'Gloomy flams' are 'gloomy flames' (a curiosity); and on p. 319 that 'Stobb' is 'stab'? But none of these is thought worth a note.

Professor Rollins's prefatory notes to each ballad, historical, bibliographical, explanatory, are most thorough. He has probably read and compared more ballad sheets than any man living, marshalled them by their kinds, and brought order into an untidy garden. To those who were before him, Chappell, Ebsworth, and, more recently, Sir Charles Firth, he owes much; and with them he has shown the historical value of ballad literature. His annotations are, however, sometimes elementary, sometimes needlessly lavish. It may be questioned whether anyone likely to make use of his volumes requires a *résumé* of the story or argument of the ballad. An example of the unnecessary in this respect is No. 400, *A Royal Letter from a Mournful Monarch*. This ballad quite explains itself; and so far as argument or tale is concerned ballad writers are capable only of the baldest simplicity. The extent of Professor Rollins's reading in pamphlet and broadside literature is wide and makes for interesting illustration; but, on occasion, he loses control of his notebook. No. 280, *The Bedfordshire Prophecie*, tells how Mr Godson died temporarily, and after twelve hours returned to life for a short lease of seven days. Professor Rollins instances several sixteenth- and seventeenth-century parallels (many may be found), two at some length, but the stories, which are not very close to Mr Godson's case, belong to a treatise on the whole subject rather than to a note on the particular ballad. Again, No. 337, *The Unfortunate Lady*, tells how a young woman, thwarted in love by her parents, puts an end to her life. Professor Rollins instances similar tales from Luttrell and Clark's *Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, adding, 'Nearly any daily paper will furnish modern instances'! The very full account of James Selby, *The Bloody Murderer* (No. 362), is illustrated by mention of other murders. *The Midnight Wonder* (No. 417), which tells how a sexton was frightened by the mysterious ringing of church bells, is accompanied in Professor Rollins's notes, by an account of another wonder which has nothing to do with church bells, but the story happens to be found on a prose broadside in Harvard College Library.

A few verbal or literal points of doubt catch the eye in the text and notes. On p. 313 of vol. VI Professor Rollins writes of 'Hartfordshire,' 'Hitching,' and 'Chessum.' The third of these is, presumably, Cheshunt, and the other two, though recognisable, are not so spelled to-day. On p. 45 of the same volume Professor Rollins suggests emending the 'strange and' of the text to 'strangely.' But the phrase 'did strange and admire' need not be disturbed. It is exactly paralleled in another ballad (VII, 187) with '*I strange and wonder.*' The use of 'strange' in the sense of to wonder, to be surprised, was fairly common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (see *N.E.D.*). His footnote to p. 275 of vol. VI is unnecessary. 'Rise' is here employed in the sense of 'raise,' a not in-

frequent use. Compare, for example, v. 262; 'Since the Price of their Coales, they did rise more and more.'

Professor Rollins traces and notes the use of the music and airs. Perhaps it would have been difficult to have followed the history of the various woodcuts, some of which are reproduced. But it would have been interesting to know how long some of them lasted, and through how many hands they passed. They recur with an irritating frequency, and often with the slightest appropriateness to the ballad they accompany. The dress of the figures depicted is often completely *démodé*; but penny sheets cannot expect up-to-date fashion cuts.

The editor's notes also touch upon printers and booksellers whose names, or initials, appear at the foot of these sheets. Several escaped the notice of Plomer. They fail to appear in his *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers*; and also, it may be added, in the notes by Dr F. T. Wood and Mr Ambrose Heal printed last year in *Notes and Queries*. It may be well to put these names on record. P. Pelcomb, John Shooter, Charles Thorp, James Bissell, Charles Barnet, M. Carew, J. Carew, and Theophilus Lewis were in business at the latter end of the seventeenth century. Plomer assigns the dates 1709-14 to C. Bates; but his name appears beneath many of the ballads printed in these three volumes. To T. Moore Plomer assigns only the year 1685. He seems still to have been at work in 1693. J. Wright was printing some years after 1693, the last date Plomer gives him. W. Thackeray's name appears on a ballad as late as 1696. A T. Passenger was in business in 1696. Plomer's latest date is 1695. A James Read, in business 1695-1702, does not seem to be accounted for by Plomer. The earliest date given to Ebenezer Tracy by Plomer is 1695. Here we find him at work in 1692. Professor Rollins thinks the initials 'E.M.' beneath *The Crafty Scotch Pedlar* (1692-4) may have belonged to Edward Millington. But, as Millington was chiefly a book auctioneer, either Elizabeth Mallet, or E. Milbourn, seems a more likely guess.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

ASPENDEN, HERTS.

Otway and Lee. Biography from a Baroque Age. By R. G. HAM. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xiv + 250 pp. 13s. 6d.

Students of the Restoration period are indebted to Dr Ham for bringing to light a good deal of new information about Otway and Lee; but many will wish that he had chosen some other way of presenting it. He has elected to write what he calls 'a dual biography'; and though he acknowledges the danger in his introduction, and seeks to justify his method, it is doubtful whether he has fully realised the difficulty of keeping two balls in the air at once. The effect of this constantly divided interest—now in Otway, now in Lee—is to rob the argument of continuity. One is reminded of Scott's antiquated methods in the Waverley novels ('We left the Saxon warrior...' 'But it is time to return to Rebecca...'). In a purely critical study the two dramatists might be handled together with real advantage; in a biography they tend only to get in each other's way.

There is another charge to be brought against Dr Ham in this book. It is that he occasionally allows himself to indulge in fond speculations and romantic hypotheses where his facts prove deficient. This is not, of course, an exclusively American weakness; but it is one to which even reputable American scholars seem peculiarly exposed. An instance occurs at the very outset (p. 3). 'The horoscope of Thomas Otway was cast many centuries before his birth. Could he as a child have entered the church at Trotton, near which he was born, and scraped away the successive layers of whitewash and plaster, he might have discovered there a wall painting for the sinners of an earlier generation, but one not a little apropos to his own. The process of repair has since revealed our Lord, together with his servant Moses, judging the good and evil of this world. . . . It is somewhat dubious whether young Otway, playing about the church of which his father was curate, would have let this homily sink into his soul. . . .' Surely it is hardly worth Dr Ham's time to consider what effect a mural painting hidden by plaster and whitewash might have had on young Otway, if he had ever seen it. Elsewhere, too, in his reference to Downes the prompter as 'old Downes,' and to the poet Settle as 'Elkanah,' he betrays the same tendency to sentimentalise the past.

Dr Ham's biography, however, contains so many genuine additions to his subject that the present reviewer would willingly forget its deficiencies. The thoroughness of his investigations may be seen from his examination of the circumstances leading to the death of Otway, and his successful tracing of the murdered Blackstone or Blakiston in the columns of the *London Gazette*. His critical abilities are evident when he is dealing with such relevant issues as the influence of Hobbes upon the aristocratic philosophy of the Restoration, and so, indirectly, upon the drama, or the effect that 'the unconstrained art of the comedian' (as distinguished from the more rigid technique of the tragedian) had upon the development of comedy. Had Dr Ham been less concerned with being readable, he would—to one reader, at least—have been still more so.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

The Dramatic Works of William Burnaby. Edited by F. E. BUDD.
London: Scholartis Press. 1931. 469 pp. 24s.

William Burnaby—there can be few who are aware of this—lies buried in the Poet's Corner. Part translator of the *Satyricon*, author of three witty comedies (and a poor adaptation of *Twelfth Night*), he has never yet had his due. 'Fame,' he wrote in the preface to *The Reform'd Wife*, 'is a good that never arrives to us till we are past enjoying it, and we are only immortal when we are no more.' Dr Budd's scholarly edition has not placed Burnaby among the immortals; but it should be now impossible to ignore this witty dramatist any longer. It is not, however, difficult to understand why, even in his own day, Burnaby's plays were neglected. They failed for the same reason as *The Way of the World*—because they

were Restoration comedies flowering out of season. By 1700, when his first comedy was produced, the taste, for new plays at any rate, was moving in the direction of sentiment and reformation. Burnaby writing the old aristocratic comedy of the Restoration type, with its heartless intrigues and its fun at the expense of the citizen, was not quite up to date. He refused to compromise like Cibber, and he had to take the consequences.

Dr Budd has not only rediscovered Burnaby for the modern reader, but he has found, in the Public Record Office and elsewhere, a surprising amount of information about his life. It should be explained that he identifies the playwright, who, before the publication of Whincop's *Scanderbeg* (1747), was always referred to as 'Mr Burnaby,' and after that as 'Charles Burnaby,' with the William who translated the *Satyricon*. This bold step will not dismay anyone familiar with the eccentricities of eighteenth-century biography, and Dr Budd makes out a strong case for his ascription. In his handling of the text, he will not please every scholar; but that, in the present chaotic state of editing, is not perhaps possible. If anything, he has been too conservative. For an editor who justifies certain small alterations on the ground that they 'merely remove a source of annoyance to the eye,' it seems illogical to preserve in the text such contractions as 'Capt.' and 'Col.' and 'Gent.' (e.g. 'These Gent. have no regard to a Lady's Honour,' p. 199). In the question of punctuation, too, he sometimes shows respect for what is possibly no more than a printer's carelessness, e.g. 'The Town is a Mrs that grants her Favours from Humour and her fine Play, is often like her fine Gentleman, a Thing without Wit or Design' (p. 275). The first comma may have been set there to indicate a rhetorical pause and so bespeak a better reception for what follows; but it is more likely that the printer inserted it four words too late.

Dr Budd dismisses Burnaby's blank verse in *Love Betray'd* with the remark that 'the first principles of blank verse seem to have remained a mystery to him.' An examination of Burnaby's play seems to bear out this assertion; but the problem of blank verse in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century dramatists can hardly be dismissed so easily. Is it credible that almost every one of them failed on occasion to write what we should now consider tolerable blank verse? Vanbrugh, Cibber, Mrs Centlivre, all wrote a curiously halting and uneven verse which can hardly be other than intentional. The problem has never been satisfactorily dealt with by any editor; but it seems probable that the highly irregular blank verse of this period was so by design, and was intended to bridge the gap between the formality of regular verse and the easy colloquialism of prose dialogue.

The notes in this edition are uniformly good. The editor tells us without pedantry what we need to know, and reminds us briefly and accurately of what we might forget. A few difficulties have passed unnoticed; e.g. the words 'after a groaning' in the prologue to *The Ladies Visiting Day* require some explanation, which would probably be found in an elucidation of the 'Lewd Mimmicks' immediately before. On p. 238 'an

English Cuckold can only Squabble, call Names, and put himself into print' probably refers to the notorious divorce proceedings of the Duke of Norfolk, which were still a public topic in 1700. The introduction is perhaps rather too full, but Dr Budd was working an almost virgin soil, and had not the option of referring his readers to other studies of his author. One learns to grow suspicious of rediscovered writers, but Burnaby was well worth his editor's pains.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

L'Idée de l'Art pour l'Art dans la littérature anglaise pendant la période victorienne. Par LOUISE ROSENBLATT. Paris: Champion. 1931. 328 pp. 45 fr.

This is a readable study, well written and fully documented. Detecting the genesis of the 'Art for Art's sake' theory in England rather than in France, the writer proceeds to trace the idea of autonomy in art from the earlier English romantics to Ruskin, Arnold, Pater and the pre-Raphaelites and from thence to its more radical exponents at the close of the last century. An historical survey of this sort necessarily embraces a good deal of material already familiar, especially when, as in the present case, the critic bravely resists the temptation to ride a hobby horse. But Mlle Rosenblatt's methodical assemblage of evidence, her clarity in exposition and her sense of critical perspective, render her work an important contribution towards the study of nineteenth-century æsthetic. On the few occasions when she allows herself to ventilate independent theories, as in the section on Stevenson and in parts of her concluding summary, her case is well supported and worthy of consideration. Her researches into periodical literature, likewise, have disclosed many forgotten passages of importance and interest, such as the pious effusion of a contributor to the *London Quarterly* who connects the high moral tone of the Crystal Palace with the low rate of illegitimate births in London (p. 31).

Two objections may reasonably be raised, not so much against the case which Mlle Rosenblatt submits as against its implications. If 'Art for Art's sake' as understood by the *fin de siècle* school with whom it is commonly associated is to be connected with any or every notion of autonomy in art, it is no peculiar outgrowth of the nineteenth century, and its ancestry is far older than German romanticism. If, as Mlle Rosenblatt admits, it ultimately resolves itself into the cult of form independent of ethical preoccupation, many writers of the Renaissance, not to mention their classical originals, have at least as strong a claim to be included in the tradition as have Ruskin or Arnold. It is not suggested that the treatment of the subject from this broader standpoint is either a practicable possibility or within the scope of Mlle Rosenblatt's thesis, but merely that she somewhat overstates the novelty of the romantics' contribution, ignoring the significant elements of classicism in the cult of 'Art for Art's sake.' This bias would account for her exaggeration of the conflict between romantic æsthetic and the bourgeois morality which,

from another aspect, was its very strength and stay. With this caveat, the book may be recommended as a scholarly and interesting treatise which should hold the reader's attention throughout.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

The Position of Bernard Shaw in European Drama and Philosophy. By MARTIN ELLEHAUGE. Copenhagen: Levin og Munksgaard. 1931. 390 pp. 15 kr.

The day is past when it was possible to regard Bernard Shaw as a writer who played with ideas like a juggler, with no more serious intent than to do his trick as skilfully and as entertainingly as a Cinquevalli. If there are still any critics who are prone to support such a theory, they should at once read this careful study which was written as a thesis for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy at the University of Copenhagen.

In these pages Shaw is presented neither as a master of paradox—the clown and mountebank of popular legend—nor yet as the deeply original thinker that some of his devotees have found him. He is given a place as one, though perhaps the most brilliant, of that modern school of European dramatists who were sensitive to nineteenth-century movements in philosophy—his chief claim to distinction being that alone among British playwrights he successfully attempted to popularise philosophic ideas among the people at large through the medium of drama. How revolutionary was this attempt it takes, perhaps, an Englishman fully to appreciate.

Herr Ellehauge is nothing if not thorough. Nearly one-half of this thick volume must be perused before Shaw himself is more than mentioned. Throughout this section of the book the ground is being carefully prepared by a careful survey of the origin and nature of modern realistic drama, the revolt of reason against conventional morality and against rationalistic ethics, a survey, in short, of that whole European movement in ideas, in politics and philosophy which provided the impulse and inspiration of Shaw's *œuvre*. This Prologue, as it were, to the main body of exegesis, is by no means a merely theoretical flourish. Chapter and verse are supplied by a copious stream of quotation from the plays of Shaw's contemporaries or immediate predecessors—Strindberg, Ibsen, Tolstoy, Wedekind, Brieux, Henri Becque and others. The philosophic systems, too, of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Bergson are ransacked for those features which, it is averred, contributed so much to Shaw's intellectual make-up.

One is left with the impression that it is, after all, the vitalistic theory of Bergson that has furnished the prevailing pattern of the Shavian philosophy. Bergson supplied the way of escape from pure rationalism with its concomitant of determinism, ideas which have always obviously fascinated Shaw but against which his gorge has always revolted in the end. Or, as our author puts it:

As Bernard Shaw measures conduct and estimates phenomena by rationalistic standards, yet repudiates the central rationalistic theories, so he applies naturalistic

standards in his social analysis and his construction of ethics, yet condemns the creed of mechanicalism involving the theories of determinism and human irresponsibility.

This apparent contradiction in Shaw's mind is possibly less the result of a fully realised intellectual dilemma than of those natural high spirits upon which Herr Ellehauge does not, perhaps, lay quite sufficient stress. This irrepressible gaiety (by no means to be confounded with frivolity) must be regarded as a fundamental factor in Shaw's equipment as a dramatist, besides providing the explanation of Shaw's reaction against the pure determinism which overcast a Wedekind and terrified a Strindberg. Shaw's gaiety has been, in any case, an integral part of his attitude to life, and has not, as Herr Ellehauge seems tempted to think, been a jester's cloak deliberately assumed for the purpose of popularising his plays among an uneducated or too conservative public.

Herr Ellehauge, on the other hand, is undoubtedly right when he displays Shaw's native optimism as reinforced by his whole-hearted acceptance of Bergsonian developments in the theory of evolution. From the rock of an intellectual faith in the 'Life Force' Shaw can view the disasters of humanity as we know it with comparative equanimity. Even if the present trend of progress prove utterly abortive, Shaw can afford to suffer the extinction of humanity in the sure and certain hope that the Life Force has a better experiment up its sleeve. Shaw, indeed, as regards the past or the present has no more illusions than the most disillusioned of his contemporaries. He yet remains a man of courage and of the race of the prophets.

Enough has been said to show that this book is an interesting attempt to 'place' Bernard Shaw in a perspective which is at once contemporary and historical, not the least valuable part of the book being that which deals with the work of those great writers from whom Shaw himself derives. Herr Ellehauge finds some difficulty in regard to certain of Shaw's inconsistencies in political and sociological creed, but many of these difficulties vanish if one views the Shavian attitude in relation to that movement of Fabianism which seems to have escaped his present critic's notice. Seeing that the book has been translated into English, it is a pity that the copious extracts from foreign plays have been left in the original. No reader without a knowledge of German could gain the full value of these quotations and of the author's comments thereon.

GEOFFREY WHITWORTH.

LONDON.

PIERRE TRAHARD. *Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIIIe siècle* (1715-89). Tome I. Paris: Boivin. [1931.] 289 pp. 30 fr.

The able editor of Mérimée's works has here turned his attention to the eighteenth century and to that particular aspect of it which, until the recent studies of MM. Mornet and Monglond, has been most neglected. The end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth lost the admirable balance of reason and feeling which had distinguished the best work of the classical period and in particular that of Racine. The

two elements warred on each other and each appeared in cruder form. The cynical, pleasure-loving generation of the Regency sought escape from reality in the artificial emotions of the novel and the play. How strong was the desire for sentiment, emotion and passion throughout what is generally considered the age of reason is shown by the success of Marivaux's plays and Prévost's novels, and by Voltaire's response in his drama to the demand for violent emotions. M. Trahard has undertaken the delicate and interesting task of tracing the evolution of 'la sensibilité' throughout the century, and in particular in its three chief exponents, Prévost, Diderot and Rousseau. At the outset of this first of four volumes he judiciously protests against a kind of literary snobbery prevalent in our time, which consists in belittling the eighteenth century and the Romantic period and in acknowledging nothing but the classical tradition in French literature. The literature of any country should be looked on as an organic whole; rigid division into periods makes the study of thought and literature artificial; periods of transition are all-important, and the threads of continuity should be carefully preserved, not rudely broken. While foreign influences played an important part in building up the atmosphere of French Romanticism, especially in externals, their importance is too often exaggerated. The essentials of the Romantic temperament are all present in its eighteenth-century predecessors. Byron's success would not have been so immediate and so far-reaching had not Prévost's *Cleveland* and Patrice suffered in the first half of the century from the as yet undiagnosed 'mal du siècle.'

In his analysis of 'la sensibilité' (which I hesitate to translate because the use here made of it is so comprehensive, including the whole range of sentiment, emotion and passion), M. Trahard distinguishes three periods: one (1720-40) of initiation with Marivaux, Prévost and Voltaire, one of fruition (1740-70) with Vauvenargues, Diderot and Rousseau, and one of deviation (1770-89) with such writers as Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Restif de la Bretonne and Choderlos de Laclos. This first volume, while it includes a penetrating analysis of Marivaux's presentation of the subtler shades of feeling—the dawn of love, its precarious happiness, its subterfuges and stratagems, its doubts and fears, its gradual waning—and a straightforward account of Voltaire's attempts to please his public with dramatic studies of passion, very properly concentrates on Prévost, the greatest forerunner of Rousseau in the domain of 'la sensibilité.'

M. Trahard is at his best in the analysis of sentiment. Both in the details of the works on which he comments and in the facts of Prévost's life he is unreliable. If it is desirable to give a biographical background to a work of this kind, it is very important that such information as is based on reliable scholarship should be soberly stated and carefully distinguished from legend and supposition. This, I believe, M. Trahard has endeavoured to do in the case of Prévost, but not very successfully. His outline of Prévost's life makes pretty reading of the 'biographie romancée' type, but, without deliberately altering any of the facts, he subtly imposes on them an interpretation which is, to say the least, misleading. M. Trahard has not used first-hand sources; there was no

need to do so when the biographical chapter was only incidental; but he should not in that case take it upon him to estimate the value of the various evidence and give a comprehensive judgment. I know that he does not set out to offer any new light on Prévost's life. I only complain that he leaves it rather more obscure than before, by giving equal importance to reliable and unsubstantiated evidence. He treats all the contemporary chroniclers alike as unreliable and spiteful; Ravanne was both, but Jordan was a fair-minded man and an admirer of Prévost's wit and wisdom. M. Trahard perpetuates, as a possible explanation of the imprisonment scandal M. HARRISSE's tentative suggestion about a 'traite fournie à un éditeur,' only offered in the absence of further light on the question and which M. HARRISSE himself would no doubt have withdrawn, had it been possible, on the discovery of new evidence (p. 94). Cambridge is mentioned as one of the places visited by Prévost; any evidence in support of this would be extremely valuable; we know that he held the university and its alumni in high esteem, but evidence of a visit has hitherto been lacking.

All this is, however, amply compensated for by a masterly analysis and estimate of Prévost's character in all its complexity (pp. 104 ff.). M. Trahard brings out with sympathy the essential humanity of the man, the qualities which endear him to us whatever his sins and shortcomings may have been. With regard to the vexed question of the autobiographical element in Prévost's novels and in *Manon Lescaut* in particular, M. Trahard maintains a judicious attitude, considering very wisely that it is more important to realise the general effect of personal experience in enriching the artist's sympathy and understanding than to pursue in detail the autobiographical element in any particular novel.

Such inaccuracies as there are in M. Trahard's accounts of the works he analyses appear to be due to hasty reading or a treacherous memory; there is every excuse for confusing the mazy intricacies of Prévost's longer novels, but these errors, unimportant in themselves as they may be, are disturbing in their cumulative effect. The Man of Quality is made to leave his retreat 'pour accompagner son jeune ami, le Marquis de Rosemont, qui voyage en quête d'aventures amoureuses,' whereas in reality he is appointed by the young man's father as tutor and companion on his travels with the express design of forming his character. Renoncour and Rosemont are frequently confused (e.g. pp. 118-19), and the former is credited with more than his fair share of love affairs. It might have been more dramatic had Rosemont seen Nadine take the veil as M. Trahard believes ('Cette prise de voile est une des scènes les plus émouvantes que Prévost ait décrites,' etc., p. 120), but Prévost expressly states: 'Le lendemain, qui était le jour de la cérémonie, il me parut si pressé de douleur que je ne lui conseillai point de se rendre avec nous à l'Eglise. Il demeura seul dans sa chambre, où je vins le rejoindre le plutôt qu'il me fut possible.' The quotation on p. 119 describes a visit to Nadine some days after her vows had been taken. On two occasions (p. 111 and p. 123) M. Trahard specifies a total of sixteen love affairs in the *Mémoires d'un Homme de Qualité*. The point is trivial, and the insistence on it is probably

purely rhetorical, but it would be as well to be exact; there are far more love stories than that in the *Mémoires*, and not all the victims mentioned on p. 123 die as described. Of the four who are said to die of love, 'la princesse de R... fut atteinte de l'apoplexie qui la fit mourir en un moment,' and Milady R... was mortally wounded by M. de B... who was trying to force his way into her apartments to surprise his wife in an interview which Milady R... had arranged for her with Rosemont. A more serious error occurs on p. 183, where an interesting and valuable theory of M. Monglond is most unfortunately misrepresented. It is not the Doyen de Killerine himself but Patrice in whom M. Monglond sees 'un ancêtre de René et d'Obermann'; and M. Trahard seems to underestimate the importance of the character of Patrice, whom he dismisses as 'un être inconstant, faible et léger.' Patrice may indeed be considered the first sufferer from 'le mal romantique.' The analysis of the Doyen's character which follows is, however, admirable.

In studying the problem presented by the love of Cleveland and Cécile, it is strange that M. Trahard should have thought of comparison with *Phèdre* rather than with *René*. There is a restless, romantic quality in this unhappy passion which is more akin to the spirit of the later work.

On the whole, however, M. Trahard's critical estimates are admirable, and the book is one of the most stimulating yet published about the eighteenth century in France. It is beautifully printed and illustrated. The publication of the remaining three volumes will be eagerly awaited.

M. E. I. ROBERTSON.

MANCHESTER.

Walter Scott et le roman 'frénétique.' By REGINALD W. HARTLAND. (*Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée*, LII.) Paris: H. Champion. 1929. 266 pp. 40 fr.

In the whole range of subjects for study in comparative literature and in literary 'influences,' one of the most difficult and intricate is that of establishing in French Romanticism which themes are the reflection of English influence and which are simply the result of parallel development in France: the logical aftermath of Rousseauism which owes little or nothing to books or events outside France.

Of this wide field Dr Hartland explores that part which is concerned with the development between 1800 and 1850 of the use of the terrifying, the supernatural, of violence and murder—in a word of the 'frénétique'—as essential parts of the machinery of the popular novel in France. The author takes as his point of departure Horace Walpole's *Castle of Otranto*, whence he follows the fortunes of the new genre of terror through the works of Miss Reeve, Mrs Radcliffe, Monk Lewis to the *Waverley Novels*. To these 'frénétique' elements, due largely to the cult of the 'Gothic' and mediæval history, is added the new element of brigandage, either fictitious or founded on true annals of crime, of which the outstanding example is Schiller's *Die Räuber*.

The chief French novelists considered in detail are d'Arlincourt, Charles Nodier, Victor Hugo, Roger de Beauvoir and Soulié. Very full treatment is given to the novels and stories of Nodier, that lovable personality whose opinions and judgments exercised so profound an influence on his young admirers of the Romantic Cénacle. But, perhaps fortunately, Dr Hartland does not keep within the limits of his subject when he gives long analyses of Nodier's works, and when he discusses at some length the admiration in which Nodier held Shakespeare, or the various sources of *Trilby*, admitting finally that the traces of the 'frénétique' are 'heureusement rares.' These digressions give to the chapter on Nodier a wider interest than it would have had if it had kept strictly to the point at issue, and make it a valuable general study of the foreign elements in French Romanticism. Unfortunately at this point and later the book tends to be confusing by reason of subtle and not obvious distinctions between the roman 'noir,' 'terrifiant' and 'frénétique.' It is, moreover, regrettable that the restrictions of the subject do not permit a more detailed consideration of the later and greater novels of Victor Hugo—*Notre Dame de Paris*, *Les Misérables* and the rest—because the origin of the 'frénétique' elements in *Claude Gueux* and *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné* seems not so obviously to be found in the works of English novelists. These two novels were intended as propaganda in Hugo's famous campaign for the reform of criminal legislation, and to this end the horrors were deliberately introduced. Also there is much elsewhere that suggests that such tendencies towards the gruesome or terrifying were inherent in the character of Hugo. A glance at the matter of *Les Orientales*, written during this period (in which the influence of Byron, although perceptible, is, surely, very small), seems to endorse this opinion.

The scope of this study is very great, entailing knowledge of scores of novels that were popular in their day. It is difficult to treat such a subject adequately, giving due attention to the numerous works of now half-forgotten writers, without falling into the tedium of the encyclopædia. Dr Hartland has succeeded in making this vast subject interesting and in keeping the general outline in view in spite of the great mass of detail, which in itself is no mean achievement. His bibliographical appendices are very full and useful.

L. W. TANCOCK.

LONDON.

CARLO BATTISTI. *Popoli e lingue nell' Alto Adige: Studi sulla latinità Altoatesina*. With 3 maps and 2 statistical tables. Florence: Bemporad. 1931. xi + 401 pp. L. 50.

In this work, the fruit of twenty-five years of patient research, the author discusses the linguistic problems of the newly acquired Italian provinces in their historical development, present condition and future prospects. The book falls roughly into three parts. Of the ten chapters, the first five are devoted to an account of the pre-Roman history and gradual Romanisation of the territory under consideration. Next comes a discussion of the available data and a comparison of the lexical and

grammatical characteristics of the Grisons, Alto Adige and Friuli with those of North Italy. This is followed by a masterly summary of the 'Ladin question,' in which the gradual change of view since Ascoli's days is fairly presented. The last four chapters describe the subsequent Germanisation, the conditions prevalent in 1918 and the changes taking place there to-day.

From the beginning of his book the author insists on the close connexion of the Alto Adige with North Italy rather than with the German territory north of the Brenner. An examination of the archæological remains found there proves conclusively that the first waves of immigration came from the south through the Trentino. It was only in the last centuries before the Roman conquest that the Brenner became a commercial highway. At the same time the Alto Adige and the Trentino were gradually separated as the new waves of immigrants did not advance beyond Bolzano. The Romanisation of the Alpine territory was a slow process, partly owing to the absence of *centri urbani*. What is now known as Alto Adige was then divided into three parts: the northern and largest going with Rhætia and Vindelicia, the eastern with Noricum and the southern with Tridentum.

Of the history of the region we have very meagre details in Latin and Vulgar Latin writers. We know, however, that Noricum (which included the Dolomitic zone where Ladin is still spoken) was Romanised earlier and more thoroughly than Rhætia. The Romanisation of the entire region proceeded more rapidly from the third century A.D. with the construction of the great roads to the north on the track of the old barbarian routes. The Alto Adige has suffered various historical vicissitudes: in the middle of the sixth century it belonged to the Frankish kingdom, later it formed part of the Longobard Duchy of Trento; in 778 Charlemagne gave much of it to the Duke of Bavaria, but in 935 Hugh of Provence, King of Italy, withdrew Trento and Bolzano from the Bavarian dominion and forty-one years later Otho II joined them to the March of Verona. During all this time little is known of the administrative divisions, conditions of agriculture and tenure of land in this region. The chief occupation of the inhabitants of the Isarco valley seems to have been sheep- and cattle-farming, while in the district of Bolzano vine-growing goes back to very early times; place-names and old documents attest the presence of *castella* scattered about the province.

The language spoken in the Alto Adige in the Vulgar Latin period and in the Middle Ages may be reconstructed up to a certain point by a study of the modern dialects of the Dolomite valleys of the Gardena, the Gádera, Marebbe, Fassa¹ and in the 'zona mistilingue' between Merano

¹ In using the Dolomite dialects of to-day to reconstruct neo-Latin speech in the Alto Adige in the pre-German period, it must be remembered that the early political divisions did not correspond with the geographical ones. The result was that colonisation in any one valley often proceeded from two different centres, bringing different linguistic currents to bear. In particular, the dialects of Badia (Val di Gádera) and Fassa were closely linked with the Friulan Piave dialectal group and therefore underwent in early times a certain Venetian influence, while the other dialects of the region show for the most part Trentino influence. Caution must therefore be used in taking words of the Eastern Dolomite group

and Salorno, and of the pre-German place-names thickly scattered about the region. These being preserved in a Germanised zone did not share in later neo-Latin phonetic changes.

Little light is thrown on early conditions by the few Mediæval Latin texts which have survived, for most of them come from German chanceries and many of the words preserved in them are apparently purely literary forms, since no trace of them is preserved in modern dialects. Another source of information regarding the early language is the loans contracted by German from neo-Latin and again the words borrowed from German by the Dolomite dialects. Place-names are far more numerous and of greater linguistic importance than family names. These, indeed, only assumed a definite form in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It has also to be borne in mind that the most valuable source of family names—the parish registers—date back only to the seventeenth century. Examining a number of words drawn from the vocabulary thus built up, the author—starting from the premise that the Alto Adige was Romanised at a period when there was already a marked difference between the various neo-Latin languages—regards it as proved that the Romance stratum in this region is connected with the Italian dialects of the plain and not with the Latin of Gaul; an assertion which he supports with numerous examples.

The two neighbouring linguistic groups, the Grisons on the west and Friuli on the east, are generally more conservative and less touched by influence from the south than the Dolomite dialects of the Alto Adige. When the Alto Adige agrees with either of these groups in the preservation of some form, it is more often with Friuli. The connexion with the Grisons is limited, except in the case of a few pre-Latin survivals, to words common to Italian dialects of the plain, since, in the absence of all internal ways of communication, words must have come from the south in both cases. The three linguistic groups also possess in common a series of words found in one form or another throughout the Mediterranean languages as belonging to the pre-Indo-European substratum. Geographical and political factors are of the greatest importance for the study of the development of these peripheral dialects. Taking copious examples from the various dialects of the Alps and of the Northern Plain, the author shows conclusively that phonetic changes claimed as characteristic of 'Ladin' (that once postulated linguistic unity of Friuli, the Alto Adige and the Grisons, which Battisti strenuously denies) are actually common to wide geographical areas.

From these preliminary discussions the author passes in his sixth chapter to a methodical examination of the 'Ladin question,' both in its historical and present-day aspects. Ascoli, when he published his *Saggi Ladini* in 1873, accepted the theory of Ladin unity already advanced by

for the reconstruction of the neo-Latin speech of the entire region, since, unless such words find a parallel in the place-names of the Germanised zone, it is more than probable that, instead of being original forms indigenous to the language, they are forms introduced in still earlier times through Venetian influence and which would never have penetrated to the centre and west of the Alto Adige.

German scholars, with an important reservation. He pointed out that the differences between the several varieties of speech are important, and, further, that the links by which the Friulan section is joined with the rest of the Ladin zone are less strong than those that connect the speech of the Grisons and of the Dolomite valleys. But Ascoli never exactly defined his position with regard to the Ladin dialects, although he discussed it on various occasions. In vol. VII of the *Archivio glottologico italiano*, he explained for what reasons a group of dialects, however formed, made up a dialectal family. Battisti points out that Ascoli's conception of Ladin unity goes back to a time in which the studies on the Alpine dialects were in an initial state. The rigidity of dialectal classification maintained by Ascoli no longer corresponds with the views of to-day. The faith in the individual existence of dialects is no longer tenable. Each new study on the different dialects tended to prove that the differences between the Ladin and those of the plains were due to the geographical and political segregation of the frontier dialects of the Central and Carnatic Alps. Each new work, consciously or unconsciously, went to prove that the original Ladin zone must have been very different from Ascoli's conception. Historical research has gradually but surely shown that the three members of the Ladin group have developed in almost complete interdependence, although to a large extent on similar lines. Battisti himself was the first to deny¹ Ascoli's theories, and from that time on those Italian glottologists who had formerly accepted them began slowly and for various reasons to change their minds—Salvioni, Bartoli and Parodi all agree in placing the speech of the Grisons, of the Alto Adige and of Friuli among the North Italian dialects and in pointing out divergences in the three.

In chapter VII the author passes to a study of the gradual German penetration and of the linguistic conditions in the Alto Adige and in particular in the Basso Bolzanino (where the highest percentage of Italian was spoken) at the beginning of the Great War. Place-names, forms assumed by borrowed words, and the official registers of births and deaths again give us certain data for this penetration and enable us to estimate the strength of the Romance resistance. Battisti proves conclusively that the Italian linguistic groups in the Basso Bolzanino were connected with an indigenous Italian stratum which, for various internal and external reasons, had resisted German encroachments through the centuries, so that Romanity never wholly died out there. He gives important data, too, for the constant Italian immigration into the Basso Bolzanino, which is now rapidly increasing since Italian emigration to America has ceased. The book ends with some valuable comments on the social conditions of the new Italian provinces, which cannot fail to interest all those who have visited them lately and have realised the conflicting interests and vital problems that the mixed population there is called upon to face.

The work is one that should be of value, not only to scholars but also to students, both in the historical and linguistic fields. It is rich in lin-

¹ In 1910: *Lingua e dialetti del Trentino*.

guistic examples, while each chapter is accompanied by a full and up-to-date bibliography.

ESTHER ISOPEL MAY.

PADUA.

An Old Italian Version of the 'Navigatio Sancti Brendani.' Edited by E. G. R. WATERS. With a Foreword by JOHAN VISING. (*Publications of the Philological Society*, x.) London: H. Milford. 1931. 86 pp. 10s. 6d.

SANTORRE DEBENEDETTI. *Testi antichi siciliani.* (*Opuscoli di filologia romanza*, II.) Turin: Chiantore. 1931. 47 pp. L. 10.

SANTORRE DEBENEDETTI. *Le Canzoni di Stefano Protonotaro.* Parte prima. (Estratto dal vol. XXII *Studi Romanzi*.) Perugia: Bartelli. 1932. 68 pp.

It may well be, as Zingarelli observes, that Dante 'non aveva nulla da imparare' from the legend of St Brendan; but, considering its wide diffusion in late mediæval times, it is at least tempting to find traces of this 'monastic Odyssey' among the varied threads woven into the voyage of Ulysses or even to conjecture that the singularly beautiful episode of the 'insula avium' may have been the ultimate source, though completely transformed in the poet's hands, of the motive of the neutral angels. But the importance of the publication before us is mainly linguistic. Professor Waters had been for some time engaged upon an investigation of the various Italian texts of the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* as a kind of complement to his masterly edition of the Anglo-Norman *Voyage*. The text here presented, upon which he was working until within a few days of his death, is that of the Tours manuscript, to which attention was first called by Novati and which has hitherto been inaccurately described. It appears to be the earliest of the known Italian versions, was written towards the end of the thirteenth century, in a Tuscan vernacular here identified with that of Lucca, and corresponds closely with the Latin text. The question of the language is dealt with very fully, with Waters' characteristic thoroughness, in the Introduction. He concludes that its regularity, especially in the consistent use of grammatical forms, 'suggests that the Lucchese dialect had been developed and regularised for literary purposes in the thirteenth century to a greater extent than is generally realised' (p. 38).

It will be of great interest to compare this *Navigatio* with other thirteenth-century linguistic documents from the same region, when the Accademia della Crusca gives us its promised volume of *Testi pisano-lucchesi* to follow Schiaffini's *Testi fiorentini* (1926). In the meantime Waters has left us a valuable monument of Dugento 'tosco-occidentale' prose. Curious is the translator's initial statement that Brendano 'in Venezia nato fu,' which does not occur in the later interpolated text edited by Novati, although this latter is Venetian. Did the 'de genere Eogeni' of the Latin possibly suggest 'Euganei' to the Lucchese translator, or is it a tribute to the peculiar interest taken by Venetians in the subject?

Old Sicilian, Professor Debenedetti observes, 'più che un dialetto fu una lingua, e delle lingue letterarie ebbe la fissità, la stabilità, quasi direi l'unità.' With the possible exception of a fragment of a translation of the *Gospel of St Mark*, no Sicilian prose has come down to us in its original form from the Duecento, the period of the poets of the 'scuola siciliana.' Two somewhat famous historical texts, the *Rebellamentu* and the *Conquista di Sicilia*, which (hitherto generally rejected) seem to be now gaining acceptance as authentic documents, have only been found in relatively late manuscripts and are, more particularly the latter, linguistically unreliable. We have, however, a fair number of unquestionable texts in verse and prose of the fourteenth century, ten of which are here edited as *Testi antichi siciliani*. The earliest of these, the *Pandetta de li buchirii di Missina*, dates from between 1305 and 1312. With the exception of the very curious oath of the Jews and a letter (1349) of Enrico di Chiamonte, these documents are mainly administrative ordinances and regulations; but the two latest, the *Quedam Profetia* (a lamentation in verse over the conditions of the island) and the *Epistola di lu nostru Signuri* (on Sunday observance), both of the latter part of the fourteenth century, have some literary pretensions.

In the poets of the 'scuola siciliana,' at least in the shape in which their poetry has come down to us, the language has become so standardised and approximated to Tuscan that this old Sicilian can only be detected in the so-called 'rime siciliane' and in occasional words and forms. But of one of these poets, Stefano Protonotaro of Messina, there is preserved a canzone, *Pir meu cori alligrari*, which was transcribed by Giammaria Barbieri, the sixteenth-century Modenese philologist, 'per uno esempio del puro volgare siciliano.' The manuscript utilised by Barbieri—his 'libro siciliano'—has disappeared, and the genuineness of the form in which this poem has come to us as an authentic example of the old Sicilian language, that is, whether it was originally written in Sicilian, has been frequently questioned; for three other canzoni, attributed to Stefano by extant manuscripts, are not in Sicilian, but in an Italian resembling that of the other poets of the school—the usual 'lingua lirica' of the thirteenth century. In the first instalment of what promises to be an exhaustive study of Stefano, who here appears as belonging to the later phase of the school, writing probably in the sixties of the century, Professor Debenedetti establishes a critical text of *Pir meu cori alligrari*, showing in a most illuminating fashion that it must be accepted as authentic, and that its language is a literary adaptation of the genuine dialect to the artistic exigencies of the courtly lyrical poetry with its Provençal models, the poet at times even giving Sicilian forms to Provençal words. He takes the canzone, in fact, as a deliberate attempt on the part of Stefano Protonotaro to exhibit the power of Sicilian at the time when the primacy in poetry was passing from Sicily to the Tuscany of Fra Guittone and his admirers. These two publications form a most excellent introduction to that knowledge of old Sicilian which is becoming indispensable to every student of early Italian poetry.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Laure de Pétrarque. By FERNAND BRISSET. (Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française.) Paris: Perrin. 1931. vi + 187 pp. 12 fr.

The vexed question of Laura's identity has been once again discussed by M. Brisset with learning and enthusiasm. It was, as is well known, the Abbé de Sade who tried to establish her identity on a documentary basis, with the help of tradition, family documents which unfortunately seem to be no longer traceable, some vaguely recorded facts, and obvious fabrications such as the apocryphal sonnet which was reputed to have been found in Laura's tomb. By Laura, of course, he meant Laure de Noves, the wife of Hugues de Sade. The Abbé de Sade, fired by Petrarchan enthusiasm, felt not a little flattered by thinking that a lady of his family should have called forth and inspired Petrarch's poetical laudations; and there is little doubt that the good Abbé, for whose services no student of Petrarch can be adequately grateful, was inclined to prove too much. Some of his assertions are much too trenchant, or rest on insufficient evidence; worse still, some of his evidence cannot be claimed to have been as ingenuously presented as scholarship properly requires. But one should guard against the peril of being as carping in denying, as he was over-zealous in accumulating evidence. That Laura belonged to this or that family really matters not a whit; certain facts are, however, indisputable: her name was Laure or Laurette, and she died on April 6, 1348, of the plague. Laure de Sade signed her last will on April 3 of that year, and certainly died some time before September 19 of that year when Hugues de Sade married Verlaïne de Trentelivre. Laura was buried in the Franciscan church, and the de Sade family had their tombs there.

The trouble is that this Laure de Sade was the mother of a large family, and sentimentalists, from Lord Woodhouselee to Professor Bartoli and M. Brisset, have felt disturbed by the idea of what Canon Tatham calls Petrarch's 'misplaced passion.' It was bad enough that a man endowed with several ecclesiastical benefices should proclaim his devotion to a lady; but it was intolerable that the lady whom he sang and praised, and, I would add, against whose attractions he often energetically fought, should have been bound in wedlock and so happily as to beget a considerable number of children. The Abbé de Sade found corroboration of this fact in a passage of Petrarch's *Secretum* where he pleads, against the searching questions of St Augustine, that, had his love been only of the flesh, the ravages caused upon Laura's appearance by advancing age and frequent childbirths would have long since dispelled her former attractiveness. The whole point rests on the word *partubus* given by the manuscripts against the reading *perturbationibus* found in early editions. De Sade pointed triumphantly to *partubus*, Lord Woodhouselee scornfully rejected this reading; Foscolo did not spare his jibes at the learned lord, and now M. Brisset, supported by an ingenious suggestion of Professor Hazard's, champions *perturbationibus*. Now manuscripts give *ptub'*, and from a purely paleographical standpoint *partubus* must win the day, unless it were possible to strengthen, by manuscript evidence, Hazard's suggestion that *ptub'* is the result of the misreading by an early copyist possibly due to a defective original. It would be safer to deal

with this point as if it were merely a textual difficulty and patiently to establish what is the best supported reading. Considering that the manuscript tradition brings us so close to Petrarch, conjectural emendations must have a basis in textual criticism. Our modern sense of the fitness of things would, perhaps, prefer to be offered a less matronly Laura, but there is nothing in the tone and purport of that passage of the *Secretum* that necessarily renders improbable a reference to events that may have inherently been unpleasant to Petrarch. On the contrary, he was then proclaiming to St Augustine the purity of his love, and the statement that childbearing had contributed to the coarsening of Laura's figure would well agree with his intention of chastising and mortifying the sensual aspects of his attachment precisely while he was denying them. M. Brisset has done his work well, and he has certainly succeeded in pointing out some rather serious misstatements of de Sade's casting some reasonable doubts upon the general credibility of his work. As to the identity of Laura I fancy that modern admirers of Petrarch are indifferent, and they may be well satisfied, after reading this work, with putting down the whole case as unproven.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

The Novels of Juan de Flores and their European Diffusion. By BARBARA MATULKA. New York: Institute of French Studies. 1931. xvii + 475 pp. \$4.

An Anti-Feminist Treatise of Fifteenth Century Spain: Lucena's 'Repetición.' New York: Institute of French Studies. 1931. 24 pp. 50 c.

The Works of Pere Torroella. By PEDRO BACH Y RITA. New York: Instituto de las Españas. 1930. xx + 322 pp.

Miss Matulka's work takes occasion from the reprinting of a couple of fifteenth-century 'best sellers' to embrace an encyclopædic range of topics, the details of which a reviewer must leave to her readers. It is one of the most valuable additions to Hispanic scholarship of recent years, and is indispensable to all properly equipped libraries. She treats in the main of anti-Feminism as a literary theme, and she seems to move with equal assurance in French, Spanish, Catalan, Italian and English literatures. Her range is not merely mediæval, but also enters the Renaissance, for she treats of both the sources and consequences of Juan de Flores' tales, and especially of the *Grisel y Mirabella*. In this work an important place is assigned to Pere Torroella, whom a popular copy of verses, and the absence of better work in his lyrics, raised to the altitude of misogynist-in-chief in Castilian and Catalan literatures. With characteristic thoroughness Miss Matulka traverses independently much of the ground covered by Sr Bach's prologue, giving the life, work, anti-Feminist doctrine and posthumous fame of Torroellas. Her exposition runs parallel to that of Sr Bach, but is more intelligible in its arrangement. In this section the bibliographies of the two authors are mutually complementary. They discriminate between the numerous documentary Pere Torroellas of the epoch in much the same fashion, and only differ in

that Miss Matulka rejects, while Sr Bach is prone to accept, the malicious gossip that seeks to make Juan del Encina a natural son of the Catalan poet and noble. Though both studies emanate from New York they seem to have been carried out quite separately, apart from whatever advice Professor H. C. Heaton may have given to both writers. Sr Bach has printed his work in Barcelona, but has written his preface and notes in English. This gives rise to a few inadmissible idioms (as 'lesson,' on p. 94, for 'manuscript reading') and has probably restricted the author in ideas and expression; but its principal consequence has been the demoralising of the Barcelonese printers. Sr Bach apologises for this result and prints a couple of pages of errata. Eight or ten pages would not account for those in the introduction. They affect dates, numbers of volumes, names (e.g. 'Vasconcelhos,' p. xiv), titles of books ('Quinze *jours* du mariage'), German words *passim*, etc., and cause a general disquiet in the reader's mind. It is to be presumed that the printers would recover touch when dealing with the texts in Catalan and Castilian, which are the main body of this work. I could only make a direct confrontation for 80 lines of the *Deffension de las donas* (lines as numbered by Sr Bach). These lines profess to render precisely the text of the Paris MS. There are five variations covered by the editor's orthographical rules, two of no great moment (9, *sen-yoras* for *señoras*; 42, *pietat* for *piedad*), an unacknowledged correction (15, *digne* for *dignes*), two errata (64, *aque-* for *aquellas*; 77, full stop for comma), two omissions (15, *sea do no* for *sea dona do no*; 76, *respondo*), three misreadings (49, *rustiferoçe* for *rustico feroçe*; 67, *ni alegaras* for *malegaras*; 70, *aguarde* for *squarde*). In the *Maldezir de las mugeres* Sr Bach's readings from the *Cancionero de Herberay* differ widely from those Miss Matulka records after Gallardo; but Sr Bach may be right. His line: 'Esta es la condición' lacks a syllable, and can hardly be maintained against the universal 'aquesta es...', while 'mesmo' is surely preferable to 'mismo' in a fifteenth-century author. The Hispanic Society MS. rhymes *oyos*: *antoyos*; Miss Matulka has *oios*: *antoios*; Sr Bach has *ojos*: *antojos*. The spellings in *y* and *j* are mutually exclusive, while that in *i* corresponds to both, being ambiguous. Surely, then, Sr Bach's rule of writing *j* for consonantal *i* in all cases is unwise, as it prejudges important questions of dialect. Similarly he has made imprudent use of the apostrophe, writing, for instance, 'E'n contractar, d'erissón,' where there is nothing in the texts to give a preference to *e'n* (*e en*) over *en*, which is generally preferred. The key position of Torroellas makes his work important not only in the Feminist controversy, but in the history of Castilian penetration into Catalan culture. The text has had to be recovered from some thirty different authorities, which are notably discordant from each other. To establish the readings involves a high grade of scholarship in two languages, neither of them sufficiently studied in this era. For these services and for his obvious good faith we must be grateful to Sr Bach, regretting only that in matters of detail it seems impossible to give him our confidence.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Sprachwandel und Sprachbewegungen in althochdeutscher Zeit. Von HENNIG BRINKMANN. (*Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen*, XVIII.) Jena: Verlag der Frommannschen Buchhandlung. 1931. viii + 236 pp. 13 M. 50.

Die alemannischen Mundarten (Abriss der Lautverhältnisse). Von LEO JUTZ. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1931. xii + 289 pp. 16 M.

Dr Hennig Brinkmann has given us another very valuable book, in which he carries the work of Baesecke, Frings, and Wrede several stages further. The first section (pp. 1-53) deals with the transition from synthetic to analytic sentence structure. For Gothic and Old High German prose Brinkmann uses the results obtained by earlier investigators, and points out that much of this work is inadequate owing to its mechanical nature. Brinkmann then takes Otfrid and shows us how the work should be done (pp. 27-44). He uses not 'Wortzettel,' but 'Satzzettel,' and by a careful analysis of his material is able to demonstrate clearly just how Otfrid uses preterite, perfect, and pluperfect.

The second section (pp. 54-103) deals with the contrasts between northern and southern German, and the material examined shows that no boundary line can be drawn between north and south. In this section the discussion of *i-umlaut* (pp. 77-92) is very interesting, and Brinkmann's arguments against the 'Mouillierungstheorie' seem quite conclusive. The third section (pp. 103-89) deals with language movement, and shows that phonetic interpretations of sound changes are insufficient. The place of origin of a sound change must be established, and its spread into other districts traced. This is an historical, not a phonetic process. One must work with 'Wortgeschichte,' not with 'Lautgeschichte.' An examination of a large number of words shows exactly where the sound changes arose, and proves that in general consonant changes originated in the south and spread to the north, whilst vowel changes arose in the north and spread to the south. Now it must not be objected that Brinkmann is here telling us nothing new. His main conclusion is, of course, not new; what is new is the masterly analysis of the material collected, and the historical treatment of it in the last section (pp. 189-236). Here we see how the political, economic, and cultural relations between the various districts determined the spread of linguistic innovations.

Brinkmann has collected a mass of material, and his criticism of the work of other investigators is illuminating. His English and American readers will regret that when dealing with Verner's Law he makes no reference to R. A. Williams, *The Phonetical Explanations of Verner's Law* (*Modern Language Review*, II), and in his discussion of the use of *werdan* and *wesan* in the Old High German Tatian translation he does not mention G. F. Lussky, *Werdan und Wesan mit dem Partizip Passiv in der althochdeutschen Tatianübersetzung* (*The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXIII).

Apart from its intrinsic value, which is considerable, the book by Dr Jutz is important, since it is the first attempt to treat all the Alemannic dialects together, and to show their relations to one another. Dr Jutz had

a difficult task. It was not easy to collect the material, since many articles on individual dialects have appeared in local periodicals; and it was difficult to deal with the material when collected, since the various compilers do not use a uniform phonetic transcription and, in some cases, contradict one another.

The Introduction (pp. 1-27) deals with the history of the country, and shows the various factors which determined the development of the dialects. Then each sound is treated separately (pp. 28-274), and its development in each district traced. Jutz deals with more than 1500 words—an alphabetical list occupies pp. 276-89—so that 'Abriss' is too modest a title for the book.

The arrangement of the book is excellent, and one can find what one wants with the greatest ease. Not the least valuable part of the book is a large-scale map, which makes the text easy to follow.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

SHEFFIELD.

Peasant Life in Old German Epics. By CLAIR HAYDON BELL. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. 184 pp. 20s.

Middle High German epics lie a little off the beaten track of social historians and, chiefly for their benefit, Professor Bell has translated *Meier Helmbrecht* and *Der Arme Heinrich* into modern English verse. With considerable ingenuity, the author has produced a line-for-line version in heroic couplets, employing—with but rare exceptions—the four-lift masculine line. Since three-lift feminine lines, disyllabic dip, missing of a dip for sake of emphasis, dropping of the anacrusis, and similar metrical devices are hardly ever employed, the verse is frequently reminiscent of Mr Belloc's *Cautionary Tales*. If one knows the originals this is irritating, if one does not, less than justice is done to the mediæval poets.

On the whole the versions are accurate, but there are many occasions where Professor Bell seems to be rendering the modern German adaptations—by no means reliable!—rather than the verbal subtleties of the originals. A few examples: *Meier Helmbrecht*, l. 3, *of love alone sings his refrain* is misleading. The poet is referring to epics, not to lyrics. L. 81 should have required a note explaining that Bern is Verona. A *nunne gemeit* (l. 109) is not necessarily a *pretty nun*, nor did she desert her cell because she was *turned by her beauty* (l. 110, *durch ir hövescheit*)! And why does Professor Bell render l. 1370 *wāfen, herre, wāfen* by *Weapons! Weapons!* The English version can only mean that the son was wishing his father a violent death. L. 1664 *rūher hāute drie* is not a *third rough hide*, nor in l. 1825 is *genist* a *nest*. The text says: *umbe sīne genist: in order to save himself (genist from genesen)*!. In l. 1633 *holden* are not *neighbours*. They are bondsmen-peasants performing woodcutting tasks for their master, a free peasant.

Many more examples could be quoted, but let us turn to *Der Arme Heinrich*. Professor Bell invariably retains *Herr Heinrich* and *Heinrich*.

Why not *Sir Henry* and *Henry*? Why is l. 3, *an mistlichen buochen*, translated *in manuscripts and books*? What is the difference in 1200? And how does Professor Bell know that the books were *odd* and *foreign*? In l. 10 *swaere stunde* is not *bad hours* and l. 15, *sich gelieben den liuten*, is given as *he might regale his fellow men* where *he might be praised by* (or: *be dear to*) *fellow men* would give a more adequate insight into Hartmann's relation to his hearers. Ll. 41-6 do not give the antithesis which Hartmann is working out between worldly station and virtue, l. 49 does not say that Henry was born *lord of Ouwe*; in l. 56 Professor Bell has not understood the technical term, *der rehte wunsch*, nor does his translation of ll. 66 and 67 give Hartmann's meaning. However, these minor errors in no way detract from the skill and industry with which the translator has turned close on 4000 lines of Middle High German verse into readable English.

The Introduction, pp. 1-33, conveniently summarises theories and counter-theories, and lays special and welcome stress on the sociological aspects of the two epics. We cannot agree that the mediæval epics were *shallow and conventional* (p. 1), nor that Neidhart's poetic activity falls between 1180 and 1250 (p. 11). Does the author mean life? Neidhart cannot have started writing much before 1217. When dealing with the results of local investigation obtained by Keinz, Fulda and Schlikinger, we should have expected Professor Bell to tell us how much of these results he found acceptable. On p. 15 we are told: 'Wernher would surely have aroused ringing applause with the recital of his tale under the village linden tree.' There is not a tittle of evidence which would make such a scene even remotely probable during the thirteenth century. How does Professor Bell combine his own excellently presented thesis that the peasants were, on the whole, a suppressed and brutish class with his belief that these same peasants listened to polished verse in courtly heroic couplets?

The author sums up his opinion of Wernher der Gartenaere as a poet thus: 'From the standpoint of literature, one must of course not expect this mediæval poet to have at his command the technique of present-day writers' (p. 21). Does the poet need this apology when Professor Bell himself admits a few lines further down that the work is of 'lasting interest and of universal significance'? There is an excellent bibliography.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

Mr George Gordon's British Academy lecture on *Virgil in English Poetry* (London: H. Milford. 1931. 17 pp., 1s.) is as exquisite as it is impressive. Here is a lover of Virgil who displays the qualities of the object of his love and study. There is not a sentence but is distinguished and characteristic, not a word but is right. It is a model of fine writing. But it is no mere exercise in style or gusto. The President of Magdalen

writes from a fullness and scope of knowledge, with a gift for perspective, and with friends, primitive or up-to-date, in every country and every age in which literature came to birth. It would be impossible to find a more illuminating or a better informed introduction to the theme of this piece of 'literary piety.'

C. J. S.

The Royal Society of Literature cannot be said to have produced two very attractive books in their last volumes of *Essays by Divers Hands* (New Series, vol. ix, edited by John Bailey; vol. x, edited by Sir Francis Younghusband. Oxford University Press. 1930 and 1931. 7s. each). There is good matter in them but much that is dull and ponderous. The best paper in each volume concerns Shakespeare. Professor Dover Wilson unites the two streams of his special knowledge in *The Schoolmaster in Shakespeare's Plays*, and Sir Mark Hunter says much that is new and important in his Bradley-like *Politics and Character in Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar.'* Miss Clemence Dane writes pleasantly on *The Writer's Partner*, and Lady Margaret Sackville on modern Scottish poetry. Dr R. W. Chapman, who is referred to in the Preface as 'Professor Chambers,' breaks many a butterfly upon a wheel in replying to Mr Garrod's attack on Jane Austen in a previous volume of the series. Miss Gwendolen Murphy supplies a useful bibliography of the writings of Charlotte Carmichael Stopes as a pendant to Dr Boas's biographical sketch. There are seven other contributions.

G. T.

A subject of perennial interest is very fully handled in Dr Minor White Latham's *Elizabethan Fairies* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1930. viii + 313 pp. \$3.75). In such a tangled thicket as this, or any, department of folk-lore, it is extremely difficult to trace definite pathways. The main puzzles still remain unsolved, namely the relation of faerie to witchcraft, and the emergence of the harmless, beneficent and diminutive fairy of literary fame. Dr Latham has not, perhaps, taken fully into account the influence of Protestant theology, which united all supernatural beings under one condemnation and, in a sense, necessitated the purely imaginative reconstruction of fairies. But he is admirably clear upon many other questions. He points out, for example, that it is idle to write of Shakespeare's 'Warwickshire fairies' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, when no record remains of the local fairy-lore (p. 188, n. 82). He insists, rightly, on the originality of Shakespeare's fairies, as creatures of his imagination, and indicates how much subsequent literary practice and tradition depends upon Shakespeare's invention and how little upon earlier folk-lore. This valuable book is fully documented, and the index of texts with reference to fairies is most helpful. There is a bad piece of broken type on p. 85, but I find misprints rare. The paper, however, is entirely unworthy of any book of permanent value, of the good type and press-work of the printers, or of a University Press.

C. J. S.

For some ten years before his death Leon Kellner, to whom we owe a valuable *Shakespeare-Wörterbuch* and a specimen of modern textual criticism, *Restoring Shakespeare*, had been at work on what was evidently designed to be a complete commentary, textual and explanatory, for Shakespeare's plays. At his death Kellner left in manuscript ready for publication notes, adjusted to the Globe edition, on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *King John*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *The Merry Wives*, *Julius Caesar*, *Much Ado*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Measure for Measure*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*, and *The Tempest*. This legacy has been prepared for the press and edited with a preface by Walter Ebisch (*Erläuterungen und Textverbesserungen zu vierzehn Dramen Shakespeares*, von Leon Kellner. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Walter Ebisch. Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz. 1931. xii + 354 pp. 18 M.). Kellner always recognised that textual criticism was only a means to a full and scholarly interpretation. Though thoroughly acquainted with modern methods, he was by no means carried away by conjecture. 'Der Lernende soll dazu verhalten werden,' said he, 'zu verstehen, und zu stützen, wo er nicht versteht.'

A. M. C.

Milton's Editors and Commentators from Patrick Hume to Henry John Todd (1695-1801): A Study in Critical Views and Methods (Estonia: University of Tartu; London: H. Milford. 1931. 381 pp. 10s.) is a laborious compilation of material for a book that the compiler, Mr Ants Oras, has not succeeded in writing. The material has not been digested or reduced to any kind of logical arrangement, and no new or interesting general ideas emerge from the chaos. The 'Introductory Survey of the Subject' and the few perfunctory pages headed 'Conclusion' tell us such things as that the text of Milton, 'so badly treated by Bentley, is conscientiously compared by his successors with the original editions and MSS.'—which is not true; that 'the notes in Warton's edition point out unexpected poetic subtleties' and discover subversive truths which 'prepare the way for the Revival of the Imagination'; that Todd's edition is, 'if used with discrimination, one of the most useful tools in the hands of the Milton scholar.' Armed with these and similar opinions, Mr Ants Oras attempts, not merely to summarise the work of Milton's editors in the eighteenth century, but to estimate the value and influence of their individual contributions. Had he been content to provide a guide to this mass of Milton commentary, his book might have been a useful supplement to Good's *Milton Tradition*; and he might then have succeeded in reducing it to logical arrangement and proper proportions.

B. A. W.

The twentieth century has brought a new terror to the dead—the psychological investigation. Dr C. van Doorn, though not claiming to be himself a psychologist, has been so impressed by the attempts of Heymans and Wiersma to put genius into a number of simple categories, that he has applied their method to Swift, in *An Investigation into the Character of Jonathan Swift* (Amsterdam: N. V. Swets and Zeitlinger. 1931. 3 fl. 90).

The method consists of asking ninety questions (Is the person in question fond of music? Does he repeat the same stories? Is he fond of games like whist and patience, or does he prefer games of hazard? etc.) and then finding the correct answers. To six of the ninety questions Dr van Doorn has no reply to make; the evidence is apparently insufficient. His answers to the other eighty-four, however, will appear to many of Swift's readers far too confident; there is often as much evidence on the one side as on the other. Occasionally, too, Dr van Doorn, working mainly from the *Correspondence* and the *Journal to Stella*, fails to see the significance of Swift's likes and dislikes. He speaks, for instance, of Swift's 'dislike of taverns'; but how far was this a genuine distaste, and not merely a dislike—so frequently expressed to Stella—of paying for his own dinner? How far, too, is one ever justified in taking scraps from letters, written perhaps lightheartedly in the mood of the moment, and regarding them as evidence of a permanent and settled disposition?

Dr van Doorn's investigation is not likely to satisfy the psychologist, and to the literary scholar it must appear sadly naïve. The bibliography, with its indiscriminate reference to the works of Mrs Pilkington, William James, Henry Morley (*A First Sketch of English Literature*), will indicate the scope of this investigation; and references at the foot of a page to 'Smith, 198,' with no indication in the bibliography as to who Smith is, are not likely to soothe the impatient reader. When all is over, do we know anything more about Swift for Dr van Doorn's investigation? We have learnt, indeed, that in Swift's character 'activity, emotionality, and secondary function preponderate more or less over inactivity, unemotionality, and primary function respectively' (p. 128), and doubtless there is some satisfaction to be obtained from such knowledge. But one suspects that Swift has been used to illustrate a system, rather than the system applied to the elucidation of Swift. There is no doubt what Swift would have said about it all: 'I must add another chapter to my *Laputa*.'

J. R. S.

Professor Roger Sherman Loomis has brought out a revised edition of his *Romance of Tristan and Ysolt of Thomas of Britain* translated from the Old French and Old Norse (New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xxvi + 294 pp. 10s.). The valuable introduction has been largely rewritten, and now includes a translation of the Welsh *Ystoria Trystan* with a list of recent works of importance on the subject of the romance. As in the previous edition, the illustrations—reproducing the designs of the pavement tiles from Chertsey Abbey—enhance the attraction of a singularly pleasant volume. E. G. G.

There are some authors, such as l'abbé de Pure and Fréron, the victims of Boileau and Voltaire, who achieve unenviable immortality through the gibes and epigrams of their illustrious critics. Nobody has read them, but their names, as synonyms of mediocrity and dullness, are on the lips of all. There is a tendency to relegate unjustly into this class Eugène Sue, to use his name as the stock example of the writer of the sensational

newspaper serial, and many whose acquaintance with *Les Mystères de Paris* or *Le Juif Errant* is only second-hand freely use as a critical weapon that an author 'reminds them of Eugène Sue.' In her extremely well-documented study, *Eugène Sue et le roman-feuilleton* (Nemours: Imp. Lesot. 1929. 226 pp. 40 fr.), Miss Nora Atkinson does not make the mistake of claiming for him the genius of a great artist. Like Sainte-Beuve, whom she quotes, she admits that Sue is an 'écrivain très peu littéraire' ranking far below Balzac, but she shows how wide was the influence, through readers drawn from all strata of society, and how valuable was the social propaganda of this painter of French manners under the Monarchy of July, whose work may be considered as the inspiration of *Les Misérables* and of much of the material of the social novel of the second half of the nineteenth century. One might, perhaps, say that too large a section of the book is devoted to the biography of Sue, interesting though that may be, but the wording of the title forestalls any too dogmatic complaint of this type. The concise analyses of Sue's greater novels are admirable, as is the chapter in which the various social types are discussed.

As a work of reference upon a vast subject this book ranks in usefulness with the famous *Répertoire de la Comédie Humaine*, but, whereas the latter is merely a dictionary, this book, written in faultless French, is most interesting reading throughout.

L. W. T.

Explication de la littérature allemande by Professor René Lote of the University of Grenoble (*Bibliothèque de la Revue des Cours et Conférences*. Paris: Boivin. 1931. 188 pp. 15 fr.) is hardly what it calls itself; it is a rapid gallop, not through the literature of Germany, but only through that literature since the eighteenth century. As an 'explication' it is naturally focussed to French eyes; to the foreign student it will hardly commend itself, but it will interest him as an illustration of the modern French attitude to its theme. Professor Lote's zig-zag progress through the centuries is often confusing, and names are prodigally scattered across its pages; and to these are tagged phrases, often brilliant, but not always true. One misses a patient effort to understand the German mind and occasionally resents M. Lote's dogmatic judgments.

J. G. R.

We have received the fifth volume of the excellent series of 'Testi cristiani' (with Italian versions on the opposite page and commentaries), which passes from the Greek and Latin Fathers to the full period of Scholasticism with Duns Scotus: *Duns Scoto, Summula, scelta di scritti coordinati in dottrina*, by P. Diomede Scaramuzzi of the Franciscans of Quaracchi (Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina. 1932. lxiv + 302 pp. L. 22). Instead of presenting the text of any single work of his author, the editor has selected and strung together passages (of which the accompanying Italian is more often a paraphrase rather than a translation) representing the essential parts of his philosophy, so as to form a kind of *Summa*; which is probably the nearest approach to 'popularisation' of which the 'Doctor subtilis' is susceptible. There is a good and useful introduction.

E. G. G.

Some Renaissance authors of pastorals have been singularly fortunate for, by attracting Professor Mustard's attention, they have been privileged to appear during recent years under as faultless a garb as the most scholarly of editors and modern typographical craftsmanship could provide. Professor Mustard's illustrations are masterly; care with him does not imply verbosity, for he is so permeated with Latin lore as to abhor every superfluous word, and, if nothing is omitted by him that may be useful to the illustration of the texts, he never departs from the strictest rules of concision. After Sannazaro, Mantuano, Andrelini and Geraldini, he now offers to his readers *The Eclogues of Henrique Cayado* (edited with introduction and notes by Wilfred P. Mustard. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. 98 pp. 9s. 6d.), an Italian-trained Portuguese so steeped in Italian humanism as to rank with the Italians. His work was undeservedly very little known. Filippo Beroaldo rightly praised him for having composed 'uersiculos bene tornatos'; for his was a melodious muse 'cui quantum nouitas derogat auctoritatis, tantum elegantia conciliat gratiae'; and Professor Mustard's certainly no less authoritative judgment fully endorses Beroaldo's praise. Cayado anxiously sought out Politian as his master (Ecl. II); he described the havoc wrought upon Florence by the expedition of Charles VIII:

Omnia Mars bello et saeuis complectitur armis

Et sunt qui credant perituram protinus urbem; (I, 84-5)

and he rejoiced when the news of the battle of Fornovo reached Bologna (Ecl. VI). It is interesting to note that at Bologna, in June 1496, he addressed his fifth eclogue to Robert Langton, archdeacon of Dorset, who was then resident there, and Langton is made to sing the praises of England:

Pabula laeta gregi, placidas pastoribus umbras

Insula nostra dedit; coeli clementia summa est.

Non impune meos externus miles agellos

Vastabit, nostris rapiet nec ouilibus agnos;

Non aditus Gallis illic, non gentibus ullis.

Sunt uires nobis, sunt tela nocentia late,

Magnanimumque ducem plaebis numinis instar adorat. (v, 145-51)

Langton, the nephew of Thomas Langton, Bishop of Winchester, is praised as a generous protector of the Portuguese scholar. Cayado was not an inspired poet, but an accurate and laudably restrained writer of Latin verse from whose eclogues several interesting references to Italian and Portuguese scholars can be gleaned; quite apart from the importance of this work in the history of Renaissance pastoral, it has a charm of its own, and Professor Mustard deserves much credit for having rendered it accessible to a wider circle of students. Collennuccio for Collennuccio on pp. 14, 15 and in the index is, I fancy, a misprint. C. F.

Professor J. D. M. Ford and Miss Ruth Lansing have given, in *Cervantes. A Tentative Bibliography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. 239 pp. 21s.), the second notable Cervantes bibliography of recent months. G. M. del Río y Rico in his *Catálogo*

Bibliográfico de la Sección de Cervantes de la Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid, 1930) is limited to the resources of one library, which he describes and analyses with great fullness. The present hand-list covers the whole field of Cervantes production, giving a total of entries some three times as great, and though the editors term it 'tentative,' that is in the nature of things. One might even question the utility of so much completeness as is here. School texts and occasional addresses are scarcely the concern of scholarship. Serious omissions we have searched for in vain, and the inclusion of notable book reviews is welcome. For the rest, the wealth of this study in world diffusion may best be gauged by transcribing the titles of the sections: Works, Translations, Collected Works, Selections, Spurious Works, Lost Works, Autographs, Bibliography (precursors of the present work), Imitations, Music, Celebrations, Biography and Criticism, Special Topics, Periodicals, Illustrations. As a record of work done, and an indication of work to do, it will prove indispensable to Spanish scholars.

W. A.

The Harvard Council on Hispano-American Studies, under the able direction of Professor J. D. M. Ford, has commenced a series of *Tentative Bibliographies* of South and Central American literature, or rather *belles-lettres*, which are in process of issue by the Harvard University Press, represented in England and the British Empire by the Oxford University Press. The first four numbers bear the date 1931, and cover respectively *Brazilian Belles-Lettres* (by J. D. M. Ford, A. F. Whittam and M. I. Raphael. 201 pp. 8s. 6d.), *Uruguayan Literature* (by A. Coester. viii + 21 pp. 3s. 6d.), *Belles-Lettres of Porto Rico* (by Guillermo Rivera. viii + 61 pp. 4s.), *Belles-Lettres of Santo Domingo* (by S. M. Waxman. x + 31 pp. 4s.). The pages are of uniform size and typographical arrangement; and when completed, the whole range of 'tentative bibliographies' should form a portly volume of the general dimensions of *Mrs Beaton*. It is not stated whether this is the plan in the editors' minds, or whether all are to be revised so as to form a permanent bibliography; an exhaustive work is in the circumstances scarcely to be hoped for. In this series the Brazilian is the only major literature represented, and we should look for more bulky volumes on Mexico and Peru, where there should be more difficulty in determining first editions and authorship. Uruguay takes up, perhaps, less than its fair share, as its distinguished compiler has kept closer to literature, without allowing himself the liberty of 'belles-lettres'; Dominican literature is planted on a thin soil, and the author fears that some of his works may have been destroyed by the devastating hurricane of 1930. The methods of presentation are not uniform and deserve the general editor's consideration now that the undertaking is gaining substance. Mr Rivera alone makes a classification of his lists (with unclassified, doubtful and special sections). For Uruguay and Brazil the author's name occurs only once at the head of the section devoted to him; in the other two bibliographies it is repeated before each book, thus giving rise to ambiguity if there are homonymous authors. The authors' dates are mentioned, when known, for Brazil and Porto Rico. It would be a welcome

practice in other cases also, especially in view of the notorious inaccuracy of the dates in Max Daireaux's *Panorama de la littérature hispano-américaine*. Similarly it would be well to give as uniformly as possible the publishers' names. The Brazilian bibliography, which seems to us the most desirable model for the undertaking, takes the form of a straightforward alphabetical list of authors together with a separate list of periodicals. One would also like to see brought together into one section literary histories and bibliographies, a section in which foreign authors might lawfully enter. At present their inclusion or exclusion depends on chance. M. Daireaux and A. Coester, for instance, are entered for Santo Domingo, but not elsewhere; I. Goldberg and F. Denis appear in Brazil, but not G. le Gentil nor Robert Southey (*magni nominis umbra*) nor J. P. Oliveira Martins, though other entries show that 'belles-lettres' covers historical writing. Mr Cunninghame Graham's study of Antonio Conselheiro is also mentioned, as it well deserves; his other works will raise problems for the bibliographers of Colombia, Venezuela, Chile and Paraguay, while his name is linked with that of W. H. Hudson, whose novels form for English readers an indispensable background to the 'Romantic' period in the literatures of the Plate. He is not to be found within the stricter limits of Professor Coester's work on Uruguay, to which it is now unhappily necessary to add the date of D. Juan Zorrilla de San Martín's death, 1931. A revised set of instructions to collaborators might secure the desired uniformity. But whether uniform or diverse, these bibliographies are a most important addition to our knowledge of Spanish and Portuguese America, for which we cannot be too grateful. To the discoverer, as it were, have succeeded the cartographers, and there will soon be beaten tracks in these little-known literatures. The various collaborators have carried out their work in the manner of pioneers, having made long journeys and no doubt suffered heavy costs—costs which seem to place a systematic knowledge of Spanish American culture beyond the attainable objectives of British scholarship. We would pay especial homage to Professor Ford, who has had amplitude of mind sufficient to conceive a continental survey, and has brought into being a band of pupils and colleagues capable of carrying it out.

W. J. E.

We trust it is not too late to call attention to a pioneer investigation into the semantic history of a single word, traced through its connexions with the history of outward civilisation and the development of the mental outlook. Dr Josef Weisweiler has in his *Busse* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1930. 296 pp. 16 M.) treated the stem we have in Gothic *bota* and *botjan*, Engl. *boot*, etc., but with special reference to its destinies in High German in its simpler craftsman's sense of 'mending,' in its use in magic formulæ and blessings, in the phrase *Feuer büssen* (cf. to 'mend' the fire), in its legal and ecclesiastical sense of 'requit, atonement,' etc., with sidelights on the meaning-development of *poena* and *poenitentia*. The work gives proof of extraordinarily wide reading and digestion of scattered data and may be warmly commended. Its natural complement in the field of

semasiology is Dr Jost Trier's research into a whole 'field' or domain of interconnected notions and the words which express them, embodied in *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes*, vol. 1 (Heidelberg: C. Winter. 1931. 347 pp. 22 M.), for this starts from the meaning side and amasses the relevant expressions, whereas Dr Weisweiler takes a single word and explores its multiple functions.
W. E. C.

Mr F. Norman has collaborated with Dr Hans Rohl in preparing a second edition of the *Wörterbuch zur deutschen Literatur*, first published by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, and now also by G. Bell and Sons, London (1931. viii + 279 pp. 6s. 6d.). This little volume contains notes and short articles not only on German writers and their works, but also on literary and grammatical terms, such as *Anakreontik*, *Grammatischer Wechsel*. An appendix gives a list of bibliographies, periodicals, editions of texts, and histories of literature. Young students will find the book very helpful.
A. C. D.

Of recent miscellanies three contain articles of considerable interest. In the *Studies in Honor of Hermann Collitz* (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins Press. 1930. 331 pp.) the variety of the subjects discussed reflects the varied interests of the scholar thus honoured. Among many other authors Professor Sievers has a note on the *duenos*-inscription, E. Prokosch brings modern phonetics to bear on the problem of vowel shifts and mutations in Germanic, E. Sehrts equates the peculiar Gothic genitive plural in -ê with an old instrumental case, S. Kroesch discusses change of meaning by analogy, A. Taylor uses his close acquaintance with folklore to illustrate the *Friar's Tale* and Stricker's parallel, and B. J. Vos edits a hitherto unpublished letter written by Goethe under date December 18, 1789, to C. F. Schnauss (?) relating to the engraver Lips. Professor Collitz's wife has contributed a valuable biographical sketch. The *Fred Newton Scott Anniversary Papers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1929. 319 pp. 22s. 6d.) contains articles on literary theory, e.g. the approaches by Mr Whitmore, the æsthetic experience as illumination by Mr Thorpe, the laughable in literature by Mr A. P. Scott, the artist by Mr L. H. Conrad, artistry and dream by Mr Herbert S. Malory. Mr Denton deals with the discrepancy between the treatment in the first fifty-seven paragraphs of Herbert Spencer's *Philosophy of Style* and that in the last. Miss Ada Snell discusses the varying metre of *Christabel*. Mr Melvin T. Solve does not think that Shelley was greatly indebted to the American novelist Brown, who however gave him some assistance in the clarification of his concept of the feminine idea. Mr Everett attempts a solution of the Cloisterham Murder Case, Mr Fries investigates the avoidance of adjective equivalents and the use of groups like 'a rod of iron' as a stylistic feature of the Authorised Version of 1611, and Mr Fletcher thinks that Milton's *Ad Patrem* might well have been written in 1640. The *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies* (Linguistic Society of America, Language Monographs, No. vii) celebrates the seventieth birthday of the scholar who has written

the best German grammar in English. Each article is preceded by a convenient abstract of contents. Among the linguistic articles are one by Mr Aron on the gender of English war-words in the speech of German Americans, a most suggestive analysis of 'case' by Mr F. R. Blake, a proposal by Mr Kemp Malone to fix A.D. 1000 as the beginning of Middle English, and an attempt to elucidate the recession of the simple preterite in various Indo-European languages by Mr Zieglschmid. Mr Peter Hagboldt discusses the physiological and psychological aspects of reading and Mr H. Kurath gives us a specimen of Ohio speech in a transcription showing syntactical and emotional intonation. All three miscellanies have admirable portraits of the 'jubilarii.'

W. E. C.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

December, 1931—May, 1932

GENERAL.

- BRANDL, A., und R. TOURBIER, *Lebendige Sprache. Oszillographische Forschungen zum Wesen des Akzents.* (Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Acad., 1931, xxxii.) Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 10 M.
- Huntington Library Bulletin. ii. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 28s.
- JONES, W. P., *The Pastourelle: a Study of the Origins and Tradition of a Lyric Type.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- LEWIS, C. B., *Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance* (St Andrews Univ. Publications, xxxii). London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- NIEDNER, H., *Die deutschen und französischen Osterspiele bis zum 15. Jahrhundert* (Germanische Studien, cxix). Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 80.
- Proceedings of the First International Congress of Literary History (Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, iv, 1). Paris, Presses universitaires.
- Sydney University Reports. Series x (Philology), i, 4-10.
- TAYLOR, A., *The Proverb.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s. 6d.
- VAN TIEGHEM, P., *La littérature comparée.* Paris, A. Colin. 10 fr. 50.
- Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*, The. II (1931). Ed. by W. J. Entwistle. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- A Miscellany of Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures presented to L. E. Kastner. Ed. by M. Williams and J. A. de Rothschild. Cambridge, W. Heffer. 27s. 6d.
- ZIMMERMANN, F., *Register zur Zeitung für romanische Philologie.* xxxi-l. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 32 M.

Mediaeval Latin.

- DEFERRARI, R. J., and J. M. CAMPBELL, *A Concordance of Prudentius.* Cambridge, Mass., Mediaeval Academy of America. \$12.50.

Italian.

- BEMBO, P., *Gli Asolani e le rime.* Ed. C. Dionisotti-Casalone. Turin, U.T.E.T.
- BERGIN, T. G., *Giovanni Verga.* New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 19s. 6d.
- BORGESSE, G. A., *G. D'Annunzio.* Milan, Bompiano. L. 12.
- DEBENEDETTI, S., *Testi antichi siciliani.* Turin, Chiantore. L. 10.
- DE SANCTIS, F., *History of Italian Literature.* Transl. by J. Redfern. 2 vols. London, H. Milford. 42s.
- DEVALLE, A., *La critica letteraria nel 700. G. Baretti nei suoi rapporti con Voltaire, Johnson e Parini.* Milan, Hoepli. L. 12.50.
- D'OVIDIO, F., *Versificazione romanza.* I. Naples, Guida.

GUERRIERI CROCETTI, C., G. B. Giraldi ed il pensiero critico del sec. XVI. Genoa, Soc. ed. Dante Alighieri. L. 50.

HAUVETTE, H., *Littérature italienne*. Paris, A. Colin. 35 fr.

MEOZZI, A., Azione e diffusione della letteratura italiana in Europa. Pisa, Vallerini. L. 20.

Spanish, Portuguese.

BATAILLON, M., *Le roman picaresque*. Paris, Renaissance du livre. 5 fr. 50.

CASTRO, A., Cervantes (Maîtres de littérature). Paris, Rieder. 20 fr.

CAYADO, HENRIQUE, *The Eclogues of*. Ed. by W. P. Mustard. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. + 25 per cent.

CHÁVEZ, E. A., Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz: su vida y su obra. Barcelona, Araluce. 14 pes.

DIEGO, G., *Poesía española. Antología, 1915-31*. Madrid, Signo. 15 pes.

FESSLER, O., A. HÄMEL und andere, *Handbuch der Spanienkunde*. Frankfurt, M. Diesterweg. 16 M.

GUEVARA, L. V. DE, *Tres Autos*. Edición hecha por A. Lacalle. Madrid, Hernando. 4 pes.

LABORDE, E. D., *A History of Spanish Literature*. London, W. Heinemann. 7s. 6d.

LEAVITT, S. E., *The Estrella de Sevilla and Claramonte*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s.

NÓVOA SANTOS, R., *Patografía de Santa Teresa de Jesús*. Madrid, J. Morata. 5 pes.

ONÍS, F. DE, *Ensayos sobre el sentido de la cultura española*. Madrid, Residencia de Estudiantes. 5 pes.

SPELL, J. R., *The Life and Works of J. J. Fernández de Lizardi* (University of Pennsylvania Series in Romance Lang. and Lit., xxiii). Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. \$1.75.

THOMAS, L. P., *Don Luis de Góngora y Argote*. Paris, Renaissance du livre. 5 fr. 50.

Provençal.

BERTRAN VON BORN, *Lieder*, herausg. von C. Appel (Samml. romanischer Übungstexte, xix, xx). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M. 20.

French.

(a) *General (incl. Linguistic).*

BEMENT, N. S., *The Conditional Sentence from Commynes to Malherbe* (Supplement to the *Romanic Review*).

BRUNET, F., *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*. VI, 2. Paris, A. Colin. 135 fr.

Grammaire de l'Académie française. Paris, Firmin-Didot. 15 fr.

HUGUET, E., *Dictionnaire de la langue française du XVII^e siècle*. II, 17, 18. Paris, H. Champion. Each 12 fr.

(b) *Old French.*

BOSSUAT, R., *Histoire de la littérature française*. I. Le moyen-âge. Paris, De Gigord. 50 fr.

BRAEDER, A., *Zur Rolle des Körperlichen in der altfranzösischen Literatur* (Giessener Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, xxiv). Giessen, Romanisches Seminar. 2 M.

DAVY, M. M., *Un traité de l'amour du XII^e siècle*. Pierre de Blois. Paris, Bocard. 50 fr.

- Glignois, a French Arthurian Romance of the 13th Century. Ed. by C. H. Livingston. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s.
- KRAUSE, G., Die Handschrift von Cambrai der altfranzösischen 'Vie de Saint Grégoire' (Romanische Arbeiten, xix). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M. 50.
- PELAN, M., L'influence du 'Brut' de Wace sur les romanciers de l'époque. Paris, E. Droz. 30 fr.
- Saint Alexis, The Life of. Ed. by V. L. Dedek-Héry. New York, Inst. of French Studies. \$1.
- THOMAS OF BRITAIN, The Romance of Tristan and Ysolt. Transl. from the Old French and Old Norse by R. S. Loomis. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s.
- THOMPSON, A. W., The Elucidation: a Prologue to the Conte del Graal. New York, Inst. of French Studies. \$1.25.
- VORETZSCH, K., Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Sprache (Samml. kurzer Lehrbücher der roman. Sprachen und Literaturen, i). 6te Aufl. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 10 M.

(c) *Modern French.*

- Acoubar, ou la loyauté trahie. Republished with an Introduction by M. A. White. New York, Inst. of French Studies. \$1.
- BLANCHARD, M., La Campagne et ses habitants dans l'œuvre de H. de Balzac. Paris. H. Champion.
- BLANCHARD, M., Témoignages et jugements sur Balzac. Paris, H. Champion.
- BOUVIER, E., Initiation à la littérature d'aujourd'hui. Paris, Renaissance du livre. 12 fr.
- BRAY, R., La formation de la doctrine classique en France. Lausanne, Payot. 50 fr.
- BURGUND, E., Die Entwicklung der Theorie der französischen Schauspielkunst im 18. Jahrhundert. Breslau, Priebatsch. 5 M.
- CHAPONNIÈRE, P., Voltaire chez les Calvinistes. Paris, Fischbacher. 120 fr.
- CHARPENTIER, J., L'évolution de la poésie lyrique de J. Delorme à P. Claudel. Paris, Les œuvres représentatives. 30 fr.
- CHARPENTIER, J., Rousseau the Child of Nature. London, Methuen. 15s.
- DEMOREST, D. L., L'expression figurée et symbolique dans l'œuvre de G. Flaubert. Paris, L. Conard. 50 fr.
- DEMOREST, D. L., A travers les plans, manuscrits et dossiers de Bouvard et Pécuchet. Paris, L. Conard. 20 fr.
- FINESHRIBER, W. H., Stendhal, the Romantic Rationalist. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9s. 6d.
- GAIFFE, F., Le rire et la scène française (Bibl. de la Revue des Cours et Conférences). Paris, Boivin. 18 fr.
- GRIEVE, J. W., L'œuvre dramatique d'E. Rostand. Paris, Les œuvres représentatives. 15 fr.
- JÄCKEL, H., Der Engländer im Spiegel der französischen Literatur von der Romantik bis zum Weltkrieg. Breslau, Priebatsch. 10 M.
- JÄCKEL, K., R. Wagner in der französischen Literatur (Sprache und Kultur der germanisch-romanischen Völker, C, iii, 1). Breslau, Priebatsch. 9 M.
- JOSEPHSON, M., J. J. Rousseau. London, V. Gollancz. 18s.
- PELLET, E. J., A Forgotten French Dramatist: Gabriel Gilbert (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, xiii). Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. \$3.

- SAINT-ÉVREMOND, C. M. DE, *La Comédie des Académistes*. Text of the MS. of 1638, ed. by G. L. van Roosbroeck. New York, Inst. of French Studies. \$1.
- SOULA, C., *La poésie et la pensée de Mallarmé*. Paris, H. Champion. 30 fr.
- SUARD, J. B. S., *Lettres de, à Wilkes*. Publiées par G. Bonno. (Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology, xv, 2.) Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. \$1.50.
- TRAHARD, P., *Les maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIIIe siècle*. II. Paris, Boivin. 30 fr.
- VILLIERS DE L'ISLE-ADAM, *Les trois premiers contes*. Éd. critique par L. Drougard. 2 vols. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 100 fr.
- WHEATLEY, K. E., *Molière and Terence: a Study in Molière's Realism* (Univ. of Texas Bulletin, No. 3130). Austin, Univ. of Texas. 75 c.
- WRIGHT, J., *Un intermédiaire entre l'esprit germanique et l'esprit français sous le second empire: Camille Selden*. Paris, H. Champion. 45 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- GRÖNBECH, V., *The Culture of the Teutons*. 2 vols. Copenhagen, Jespersen og Pio; London, H. Milford. 30s.
- HEMPEL, H., *Allamål und germanischer Stil* (Germanistische Abhandlungen, lxiv). Breslau, Marcus. 8 M. 40.
- HIRT, H., *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*, I (Indogermanische Bibliothek, I, xxi, 1). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M.
- Jahresberichte über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiet der germanischen Philologie*, li). Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 20 M.

Scandinavian.

- Hrafnkels Saga Freygoða*. Ed. by F. S. Cawley. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- IBSEN, H., *Œuvres complètes*. Traduites par P. G. la Chesnais. III. Paris, Plon. 40 fr.
- KOHT, H., *Life of Ibsen*. Transl. by R. L. McMahon and H. A. Larsen. 2 vols. London, Allen and Unwin. 30s.
- KOHT, H., *The Old Norse Sagas* (American-Scandinavian Foundation). London, Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.
- SNORRE STURLASON, *Heimskringla, or the Lives of the Norse Kings*. Ed. by E. Monsen and transl. into English with the assistance of A. H. Smith. Cambridge, Heffer. 18s.

English.

(a) *General (incl. Linguistic)*.

- Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*. Ed. for the Modern Humanities Research Association by M. S. Serjeantson, assisted by L. N. Broughton. XI. 1930. Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 7s. 6d.
- Beginnings of American English, The. Essays and Comments*. Ed. by M. M. Mathews. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- CRAIGIE, SIR W. A., *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the 12th century to the end of the 17th*. I. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; London, H. Milford. 21s.
- Dialect Notes*. VI, 3. (Publications of the American Dialect Society.) New Haven, Conn.; London, H. Milford. \$1.50.

Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature. By Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan Press. \$2.50.

GOVER, J. E. B., A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON, *The Place-Names of Devon* (English Place-Name Society, viii, ix). Cambridge, Univ. Press. 40s.

JESPERSEN, O., *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. iv. Syntax 3. (Germanische Bibliothek, I, i, 9.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 11 M. 50.

LOANE, G. G., *A Thousand and Two Notes on 'A New English Dictionary.'* (Reprinted from the Transactions of the Philological Society, 1925-30.)

PERL, E., *Die Bezeichnung der kausativen Funktion im Neuenglischen* (Sprache und Kultur der germanisch-romanischen Völker, ix). Breslau, Priebatsch. 4 M. 50.

Studies in English by Members of University College, Toronto. Collected by M. W. Wallace. Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Press; London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

AUDELAY, J., *Poems*, ed. by E. K. Whiting (Early English Text Society, 184). London, H. Milford. 28s.

CHESTERTON, G. K., *Chaucer*. London, Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

HUGANIR, K., *The Owl and the Nightingale: Sources, Date, Author* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis). Philadelphia.

When Rome is Removed into England, Eine politische Prophezeiung des 14. Jahrhunderts, herausg. von R. Haferkorn (Beiträge zur engl. Philologie). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 9 M.

(c) *Modern English.*

ARNOLD, M., *Culture and Anarchy*. Ed. by J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.

AUDRA, E., *L'influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope*. 2 vols. (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comparée, lxxii.) Paris, H. Champion. 75 fr.

AUDRA, E., *Les traductions françaises de Pope (1717-1825). Étude de bibliographie*. Paris, H. Champion. 40 fr.

BALE, JOHN, *King Johan*. Ed. by J. H. P. Pafford and W. W. Greg (Malone Society Reprints).

BARKER, H. GRANVILLE, *Associating with Shakespeare* (Shakespeare Association). London, H. Milford. 1s.

BENSON, E. F., *Charlotte Brontë*. London, Longmans. 12s. 6d.

BEYER, A., *W. Paters Beziehungen zur französischen Literatur und Kultur* (Studien zur englischen Philologie, lxxiii). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M. 80.

BLANKENSHIP, R., *American Literature as an Expression of the National Mind*. London, G. Routledge. 15s.

BRIDGES, R., *Collected Essays, Papers, etc.* vi, vii. London, H. Milford. 2s. 6d.

BUCHAN, J., *Sir Walter Scott*. London, Cassell. 9s. 6d.

CHAMBERS, SIR E. K., *Matthew Arnold* (British Academy, Warton Lecture). London, H. Milford. 1s.

CHRISTIANI, S., *S. Johnson als Kritiker im Lichte von Pseudoklassizismus und Romantik* (Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, xviii). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 9 M.

Collections, II, 3, ed. by W. W. Greg (Processus Satanae, Somebody and Others, *Players at Ipswich, Dramatic Records of the City of London and the Lord Chamberlain's Office*). London, Malone Society.

CONNES, G., *État présent des études shakespeariennes*. Paris, H. Didier. 8 fr.

- DOBREE, B., *Variety of Ways. Discussions on Six Authors.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5s.
- DONNE, A Garland for John, 1631-1931. Ed. by T. Spencer. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 14s.
- DRAITON, M., *Works*, ed. by J. W. Hebel. In 5 vols. Oxford, B. Blackwell. £7. 17s. 6d.
- DREWS, W., *König Lear auf der deutschen Bühne bis zur Gegenwart* (Germanische Studien, cxiv). Berlin, Ebering. 11 M. 60.
- DRYDEN, J., *Dramatic Works.* Ed. by M. Summers. 6 vols. London, Nonesuch Press. £7. 17s. 6d.
- FAIRCHILD, H. N., *The Romantic Quest.* New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 30s.
- FORD, J., *Dramatic Works*, II. Ed. by H. de Vocht. (Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, New Series, i.) Louvain, Librairie universitaire.
- GORDON, G., *Virgil in English Poetry* (British Academy, Warton Lecture). London, H. Milford. 1s.
- GWYNN, S., *Life of Horace Walpole.* London, Butterworth. 15s.
- HARVEY, C. H., *Matthew Arnold: a Critic of the Victorian Period.* London, J. Clarke. 6s.
- HUMBERT, G., *Literarische Einflüsse in schottischen Volksballaden* (Studien zur engl. Philologie, lxxiv). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M. 50.
- JOHNSON, S., *Letters to Queeney Thrane.* Ed. by the Marquis of Lansdowne. London, Cassell. 45s.
- JONSON, B., *Works*, ed. by C. H. Herford and P. Simpson. IV. Oxford, Univ. Press. 21s.
- JORDAN-SMITH, P., *Bibliographia Burtoniana.* A study of R. Burton's 'The Anatomy of Melancholy' with a Bibliography of Burton's Writings. Stanford, Cal., Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- KENYON, SIR F. G., *Sir Israel Gollancz, 1863-1930* (Proceedings of the British Academy, xvi). London, H. Milford. 1s.
- KEYNES, G., *A Bibliography of Dr John Donne.* 2nd ed. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 52s. 6d.
- KOSTKA, M., *The Old Woman: One Phase of the Character Poem in Contemporary British Verse* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis). Philadelphia.
- LAFOURCADE, G., *Swinburne. A Literary Biography.* London, G. Bell. 15s.
- LINDSAY, SIR DAVID, *Works*, ed. by D. Hamer. II. (Scottish Text Society, iii, 2.) Edinburgh, Blackwood.
- LOTTER, K., *Carlyle und die deutsche Romantik.* Nürnberg, Spindler. 2 M.
- MACLEAN, C. M., *Dorothy Wordsworth. The Early Years.* London, Chatto and Windus. 15s.
- MARBURG, C., *Sir William Temple.* New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s.
- MARLOWE, C., *Doctor Faustus*, ed. by F. S. Boas. London, Methuen. 8s. 6d.
- MASSEY, B. W. A., *Browning's Vocabulary: Compound Epithets.* Poznań, Dawniej Fiszer.
- MASSINGER, PH., *The Bondman.* Ed. by B. T. Spencer. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18s.
- MCHENRY, M., *The Ulster Theatre in Ireland* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis). Philadelphia.
- MILLICAN, C. B., *Spenser and the Table Round* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, viii). Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s.

- MILTON, J., *Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises*. Transl. by P. B. Tillyard, with Introduction by E. M. W. Tillyard. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- MILTON, J., *Works*. Ed. by F. A. Patterson, A. Abbott, H. M. Ayres, D. L. Clark, J. Erskine, W. Haller, G. P. Krapp, W. P. Trent. 18 vols. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. £32.
- MORLEY, F. V., *Lamb before Elia*. London, J. Cape. 10s. 6d.
- MYERS, A. M., *Representation and Misrepresentation of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis). Philadelphia.
- OTWAY, TH., *Works*, ed. by J. C. Ghosh. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 40s.
- PARADISE, N. B., *Thomas Lodge*. New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 16s.
- PATTEN, J. A., *Sir Walter Scott: a Character Study*. London, J. Clarke. 5s.
- PEPPYS *Ballads*, The. Ed. by H. E. Rollins. VII. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- RALLI, A., *A History of Shakespearian Criticism*. 2 vols. London, H. Milford. 42s.
- RHYDDERCH, D., *Jane Austen: her Life and Work*. London, J. Cape. 7s. 6d.
- SALOMON, L. B., *The Devil Take Her: a Study of the Rebellious Lover in English Poetry* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis). Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press; London, H. Milford. 16s. 6d.
- SCHÖFFLER, H., *Die Anfänge des Puritanismus: Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation*. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 5 M.
- SCOTT, SIR WALTER, *Some Unpublished Letters*. Ed. by J. A. Symington. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 10s. 6d.
- Shakespeare Association Facsimiles. *A Dialogue concerning Witches and Witchcrafts*, 1593, ed. by B. G. Gifford; *E. Guilpin, Skialetheia*, 1598, ed. by G. B. Harrison; *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men*, 1598, ed. by A. V. Judges; *J. Norden, Vicissitudo Rerum*, 1600, ed. by D. C. Collins. London, H. Milford. Each 6s.
- Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, herausg. von W. Keller. LXVII. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 8 M.
- SLATER, G., *Seven Shakespeares. A Discussion of the Evidence for various Theories with regard to Shakespeare's Identity*. London, C. Palmer. 7s. 6d.
- STORR, M. S., *Mary Wollstonecraft et le mouvement féministe dans la littérature anglaise*. Paris, Presses universitaires. 80 fr.
- STOVAL, F., *Desire and Restraint in Shelley*. Durham, N.C., Duke Univ. Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 20s.
- SWIFT, J., *The Satires*, ed. by W. A. Eddy. London, H. Milford. 3s. 6d.
- TAYLOR, R., *The Date of 'Love's Labour's Lost.'* New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s.
- THIEL, G., *Bunyans Stellung innerhalb der religiösen Strömungen seiner Zeit* (Sprache und Kultur der germanisch-romanischen Völker, viii). Breslau, Priebatsch. 6 M.
- THORNBURY, E. M., *H. Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic* (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, xxx). Madison, Wis., Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- VAN DOORN, W., *Of the Tribe of Homer, being an Enquiry into the Theory and Practice of English Narrative Verse since 1833*. Amsterdam, N. V. de Arbeiderspers. 4 fl. 90.
- WATSON, H. F., *The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama, 1550-1800*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 20s.

- WHITE, H. C., *English Devotional Literature (Prose), 1610-40* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature). Madison, Wis., Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- WILSON, J. DOVER, *The Essential Shakespeare: a Biographical Adventure*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- WILSON, M., *The Life of William Blake*. London, P. Davies. 10s. 6d.
- WRIGHT, T., *Life of Daniel Defoe*. London, Farncombe. 21s.
- WYCHERLEY, W., *The Country Wife*, ed. by U. Todd-Naylor (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xii, 1-3). Northampton, Mass., Smith College.

German.

(a) *Old and Middle High German.*

- BELL, C. H., *Peasant Life in Old German Epics. Meier Helmbrecht and Der arme Heinrich*, transl. from the Middle High German. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$3.
- EHRISMANN, G., *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, i. 2. Aufl. Munich, C. H. Beck. 13 M. 50.
- SCHÖDDE, E., *Der Ambraser Wolfdietrich. Grundlagen und Grundsätze der Textkritik*. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M.
- Verfasserlexikon des deutschen Mittelalters. Herausg. von W. Stammler, Lief. i, ii. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. Each 5 M.
- WITTENWEILER, H., *Der Ring*, herausg. von C. Wiessner (*Deutsche Literatur nach Entwicklungsreihen*). Leipzig, Ph. Reclam. 7 M. 50.

(b) *Modern German.*

- BIEDERMANN, F. VON, *Chronik von Goethes Leben*. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 80 pf.
- BLANKENAGEL, J. C., *The Dramas of H. von Kleist*. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press; London, H. Milford. 18s.
- BRAN, F. A., *Herder und die deutsche Kulturanschauung*. Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 5 M.
- BREED, E., *Studien zu den lateinischen und deutschsprachlichen Totentanztexten des 13. bis 17. Jahrhunderts*. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 8 M.
- CASTLE, E., *Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte*. III, 9. Vienna, C. Fromme. 14 Sch.
- EHRICH, E., *Das französische Element in der Lyrik Chamisso's (Germanische Studien, cxviii)*. Berlin, Ebering. 6 M. 80.
- FAIRLEY, B., *Goethe as revealed in his Poetry*. London, Dent. 8s. 6d.
- FEDERMANN, A., *Goethe als bildender Künstler*. Stuttgart, Cotta. 12 M. 50.
- FELKIN, F. W., *Goethe a Century After*. London, H. Milford. 3s. 6d.
- FRANZ, E., *Goethe als religiöser Denker*. Tübingen, Mohr. 10 M.
- Goethe, *Études publiées pour le centenaire de sa mort*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 50 fr.
- Goethe, *Gesamtkatalog der preussischen Bibliotheken*. Herausg. von der preussischen Staatsbibliothek. Berlin, Preussische Druckerei. 32 M.
- GRILLPARZER, F., *Sämtliche Werke*. i, 10 (Gedichte, i). Vienna, A. Schroll. 14 M.
- GUNDOLF, F., *Romantiker. Neue Folge*. Berlin, Keller. 6 M. 50.
- GÜNTHER, J. C., *Sämtliche Werke*. Herausg. von W. Krämer. II. (Stuttgarter literarischer Verein, cclxxvii.) Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 12 M.
- HAGEN, H. W., *Rilkes Umarbeitungen. Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des dichterischen Schaffens. (Form und Geist, xxiv.)* Leipzig, Eichblatt, 7 M. 40.

- HEINRICHS DORFF, P., J. M. R. Lenzens religiöse Haltung (Germanische Studien, cxvii). Berlin, Ebering. 6 M. 80.
- HELLENBRECHT, A., Das Problem der freien Rhythmen mit Bezug auf Nietzsche (Sprache und Dichtung, xlviii). Bern, Haupt. 3 M. 20.
- HERTZ, G. W., Natur und Geist in Goethes Faust (Deutsche Forschungen, xxv). Frankfurt, M. Diesterweg. 9 M.
- Im neuen Reich, 1871–1914. Herausg. von H. Adolf. (Deutsche Literatur nach Entwicklungsreihen. Reihe: Politische Dichtung.) Leipzig, Ph. Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- KINDERMANN, H., Goethes Menschengestaltung. Versuche einer literarhistorischen Anthropologie. I. Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 12 M.
- Kleist-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. Herausg. von G. Minde-Pouet und J. Petersen. XI, XII. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M.
- KOCH, F., Goethes Stellung zu Tod und Unsterblichkeit (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, xlv). Weimar, Goethe-Gesellschaft.
- KROGMANN, W., Das Friederikenmotiv in den Dichtungen Goethes (Germanische Studien, cxiii). Berlin, Ebering. 5 M. 80.
- KROGMANN, W., Goethes Ringen mit Weimar (Germanische Studien, cxvi). Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 40.
- LEISEGANG, H., Lessings Weltanschauung. Leipzig, F. Meiner. 7 M. 50.
- LUSKY, A. E., Tieck's Romantic Irony. Chapel Hill, Univ. of Carolina Press. \$3.
- MARCUSE, L., H. Heine: ein Leben zwischen Gestern und Morgen. Berlin, Rowohlt. 6 M.
- MARTINI, W., Die Technik der Jugenddramen Goethes. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 8 M.
- MATZKE, F., Die Landschaft in der Dichtung A. Stifters (Schriften der Stifter-Gemeinde, ix). Kē. 72.
- MEAKIN, A. M. B., Goethe and Schiller, 1785–1805. 3 vols. London, F. Griffiths. Each 21s.
- MÜLLER, W., Rheinreise von 1827, sowie Gedichte und Briefe. Herausg. von P. Wahl. Dessau, Schwalbe. 5 M.
- MÜNCH, I., Die Tragik und Persönlichkeit F. Grillparzers (Neue Forschung, xi). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 8 M. 50.
- NEVINSON, H. W., Goethe: Man and Poet. London, Nisbet. 10s. 6d.
- PETERSEN, J., Aus der Goethezeit. Aufsätze. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 7 M.
- PRICE, L. M., The Reception of English Literature in Germany. Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 36s.
- PURDIE, E., F. Hebbel: a Study of his Life and Work. London, H. Milford. 15s.
- ROBERTSON, J. G., The Life and Work of Goethe. London, G. Routledge. 12s. 6d.
- SCHMIDT, K., Die Entwicklung der Grimmschen Kinder- und Hausmärchen seit der Urhandschrift (Hermæa, xxx). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 15 M.
- STERN, G. W., Die Liebe im deutschen Roman des 17. Jahrhunderts (Germanische Studien, cxv). Berlin, Ebering. 9 M. 60.
- VOLLRATH, W., Goethe und Grossbritannien. Erlangen, Palm und Enke. 1 M. 30.
- VOM HAGEN, P., R. Dehmel: die dichterische Komposition seines lyrischen Gesamtwerks (Germanische Studien, cxv). Berlin, Ebering. 11 M.
- WENTZLAFF-EGGEBERT, F. W., Das Problem des Todes in der deutschen Lyrik des 17. Jahrhunderts (Palaestra, clxxi). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 13 M. 60.

THE COMMONPLACE BOOK OF ARTHUR CAPELL

I.

HARLEIAN MS. 3511 is a quarto volume of miscellaneous poems transcribed by the Arthur Capell who signed his name on the recto of the folio preceding that now pencilled as 1. The MS. contains 103 folios. The first folio is blank except for the signature of Capell. The following 93 are written on and have been numbered 1-93 in pencil. (In citing folios I quote these pencilled numbers rather than Capell's pagination.) The rest of the leaves are blank. The MS. contains poems by Sidney, Jonson, Bacon, Donne, Drayton, William Browne, Cartwright, Randolph, Cleveland, Carew, Quarles, Henry King, Habington, William, Earl of Pembroke, Corbet, Strode, Robert Gomersal, Henry Reynolds, Hugh Holland, Jasper Fisher, Henry Ventrice, William Lewis and others—e.g., the anonymous authors of poems appearing in *Wits Recreations* (1640), *Parnassus Biceps* (1656), *Wit Restor'd* (1658) and *London Drollery* (1673). One or two of these poems are provided with the author's initials. The rest are completely unsigned. In consequence of this, one can only discover their existence by way of the Museum index of first lines.

The signature Arthur Capell might be that of either the father or the son. According to the *D.N.B.* the father was born probably in 1610. He became M.P. for Hertfordshire in the Short and Long Parliaments. When things took a violent turn he joined the court party, and was made Baron Capell of Hadham in 1641. After various romantic experiences of imprisonment and escape, he was executed in 1649. John, the son of Francis Quarles, included in his *Regale Lectum Miseriæ* 'An Elegy upon the Right Honorable, the Lord CAPELL, ... who was beheaded at Westminster, for maintaining the ancient and Fundamental Lawes of the Kingdom of England.' Lord Capell figures prominently in Clarendon's *History of the Great Rebellion*. The son was born in 1631, fought in the King's army at the age of twelve, and succeeded to the barony on his father's execution. In 1661 he was created Earl of Essex and henceforward took an important part in politics, becoming in turn lord-lieutenant of Wiltshire, envoy to Denmark, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and First Lord of the Treasury. His share in the Monmouth affair was betrayed. Essex was sent to the Tower and in July, 1683, was found with his throat cut, having committed suicide or having been murdered. His political

biography is written among the pages of Burnet's *History of His Own Time*.

The signature of the father for the dates 1639 and 1643 survives at the end of letters in Egerton MS. 2646 (folio 140) and Additional MS. 18980 (folios 37, 44 and 84). The epistolary signatures (which I will refer to in a bunch as L) are all in the same style and look at first sight to be developments of that inscribed in the commonplace book (I will refer to this signature as C). The capital 'A' of all five signatures is thickly interwoven with flourishes, is itself made of flourishes. The flourishing, however, of L proceeds in different manner from that of C. The difference is not simply one of development. The writer of the 'A' of C would have had to change his whole conception of the letter before he could have brought off the less involved but even stranger 'A' of L. The rest of the letters in L and C might perhaps have come from the same hand, if development is postulated. There are small discrepancies: the stroke of the 'p' of C does not rise above the top of the loop as does that of L, the double 'l's of C interlock their loops whereas the 'l's of L have no loops and a backward dash of the pen crosses them with a 't' stroke so long as to cross the high 'p' as well. All these differences might be accounted for, no doubt, in one way—by the passage of time. The evidence, however, of the commonplace book shows that C must have been written either at the same time as L or, if there were an interval of time, C must have followed the L of 1639 and 1643, not preceded them. C is done in the same style as the writing of the first eighteen folios of the commonplace book. And in these eighteen folios are poems to which dates can be affixed. One of them headed 'Mr Le Strange his verses in the Prison at Linn' (8^r) cannot have been composed before 1644 when that imprisonment began. Two folios later comes *The Lamentation of Charing Crosse*, a ballad presumably written in 1647 when the Cross was pulled down (see Wheatley and Cunningham, *London Past and Present*, vol. I, pp. 353 ff.). All these early poems are written in the same ornate italics, the italics of the signature. Since the Charing Cross ballad is the fifteenth poem in the book and is written in the same style as the signature, and since this mutual style is so ornamental and schoolboyish as to have been in all probability ephemeral, it is safe to assume that the signature itself cannot be much earlier than 1647 and may have been later. (At l. 15 of folio 8^v a capital 'A' is enscrolled on the same principle as that of the 'A' in the signature nine folios earlier.) It seems that young Capell imitated the effect of his father's signature.

That the father cannot have been the writer of the commonplace book

is indicated by a comparison of the style of the commonplace book with that of the surviving letters of 1639 and 1643. Since it appears that every poem in the MS. was available for copying down before 1649, the date of the father's execution, handwriting is the only test. The epistolary hand of the father in 1639 and 1643, though mainly italic, has relics of the secretary style. It employs the Greek 'e' plentifully and its 'l's are bent in the back like the rounded capital 'E' which is derived from the epsilon. A ligature frequently joins 's's to 'h's and 'c's to 't's. None of these and the other characteristic individualities of his hand are to be found in the hand of the commonplace book. There are, too, constant differences of spelling: the father, for instance, still writes 'i' for 'j' and often doubles a final consonant. The occasions of writing cannot account for the discrepancies, since a letter to Prince Rupert demanded as much scribal formality as the copying up of poems.

The first eighteen folios continue the self-conscious style of the signature. At 18^v the hand begins to change, a change due not so much to a quickening of the speed as to a more practised facility. On the whole, the rest of the MS. is the work of a hand out for simpler ends, though flourished letters are not infrequent. Then in the last pages there appears to be a reversion to something like the earlier hand. This reversion cannot be accounted for by postulating a rearrangement of the leaves in binding: the change takes place in the middle of a gathering of continuous transcript. On 93^v, the last page of writing, comes 'The silver swan that living had no note....' This is written in a new italic style, much more sloping and elongated. It marks a return to the MS. after a number of years. Presumably at something like the same time as this poem was written various corrections were made in poems transcribed earlier. At 40^v the words 'who died in labour' were added to the title of Randolph's poem 'On Mrs J. T.' At 42^v four lines of Randolph's poem *A Pastorall courtship* were crossed out and new ones inserted marginally¹. Both these corrections are in the hand of 'The silver swan.' This final hand is definitely that of Essex's letter to the Duke of Richmond in 1670, preserved as folio 314 of Additional MS. 21947. The resemblance is complete,

¹ There seems no reason for the drastic excisions: the new version only shows changes in three words. Corrections so deliberately made are interesting. Thorn-Drury in his edition prints the lines as first written by Capell:

No danger in these shades doth lye,
Nothing that wears a sting, but I:
And in it doth no vemome dwell,
Although perchance it make thee swell.

From the Harllett MS. (Bodleian, Firth, i, 4) Thorn-Drury gives the variant 'perhaps' for 'perchance.' This is one of the three variants in Capell's revised version, the other two being 'serpent' for 'danger' and 'hath' for 'wears.'

down to the unusual double 'e's in the 'reedy' and 'geese' of the poem and the 'weeke' of the letter. If the examples of Essex's developed hand are compared with the writing of the bulk of the commonplace book, i.e., with folios 19^r to 92^r, it can be seen that both styles belong to the same man. The flourished final 'e' persists throughout the MS. and is found again in the letters. The notable way of writing 'Th,' 'A' and a swash 'C' in the letters can be seen developing in the commonplace book.

II.

Capell's transcripts were evidently taken from MS. sources. They have frequently the effect of being carelessly done, and sometimes the effect of dealing dangerously in conjecture. Capell may have been one of three things, or perhaps a mixture of all three—a painstaking copier of corrupt or difficult MSS., a brilliant 'editor,' or simply a careless dilettante adding line after line. Certainly one is at a loss for an explanation when one finds variants such as the second of the two following, taken from his transcript of Carew. In the first edition of the poems, 1640, the elegy on Maria Wentworth reads at ll. 4-5:

Else the soule grew so fast within,
It broke the outward shell of sinne.

Capell reads 'two' for 'so' and 'skinne' for 'sinne.' He was fond of Carew's poems and transcribed thirty-one of them. Thirteen of these have no important variant. In copying these thirteen he made three slips into pure nonsense: reading, for instance, 'musique' for 'mystique.' The transcript of the remaining eighteen has some readings which any editor of Carew will have to take account of. *A flye that flew into my Mistris her eye* is almost a new poem as it appears in Capell. I reproduce his version (72^v):

On a fly.

When this fly liv'd she us'd to play
In the bright sunshine of the day,
Till coming neare my Celia's sight
She felt a new & unknowne light
So full of glory that it made
The noone day sunne a gloomy shade,
Then this amorous fly became
My rivall & did court my flame;
From hand to bosome did she skip,
And from her breath, her cheeke, & lip,
And suckt the insence & the spice,
And grew a bird of paradise.
At last into her eye she flew
Where scorcht in flames, & drencht in dew
Like Phaethon from y^e Sun's spheare
She fell, & wth her dropt a teare,

Of which an urne was straight compos'd
Wherein her ashes were inclos'd.
So she receiv'd from Celia's eye
Funerall, flame, tombe obsequy.

This version may represent an earlier or later draft of the poem than the one printed in 1640. Other poems, for instance the famous *Aske me no more...*, show interesting variants. Since Carew's poems were published posthumously, contemporary MS. copies of the poems are of the utmost importance.

Capell's versions of poems by William Browne present a problem. In the Second Book of *Britannia's Pastorals*, printed in 1616 and reprinted in 1625, there are nine lyrics breaking the narrative. The fifth of these is a song sung by 'a prittie shepheards boy' to Thetis as part of the poets' festival and is followed by an 'encore' pendant, a stanza like those of the song, and following four lines after the song has finished. Capell transcribes all the poems except the first, *Glide soft ye silver Floods...*, and the last, the Echo song. There is no encore stanza in his version of the fifth poem. He copied down the poems without a break on folios 77^v–80^v and copied them down in the order they come in the *Pastorals*. What could his copy have been? The date of his transcript could not have been earlier than the late 1640's and was probably later still. There is no likelihood that the author had anything to do with the copy. Poets do not, as a rule, circulate copies of poems which can be found printed in their proper context. Capell provides fifteen verbal variants in the total of 182 lines. Some of them are nonsense and due merely to inattention, two are bunglings of proper nouns, two make sense but spoil the metre, and five make sense, even good sense, and do not interfere with the metre. I quote two of these, both from the same poem, the love song of the river Tavy:

1. 1616 Song 3, ll. 1041 f.:

*The Saphires ringed on her panting brest,
Run as rich veynes of Ore about the mold,*

(1625 has '*painting*.') Capell reads 'ridged' for '*ringed*.'

2. *Id.* ll. 1057 f.:

*If in the meane rude waues haue it opprest,
It shall suffice I venter'd at the best.*

Capell reads '*maine*' for '*meane*.'

The questions which must be raised are unanswerable: Was Capell improving the poem as Browne left it to suit his own feeling for correctness? or was he copying faithfully a MS. which gave these variants? or

did he find his MS. difficult in places and use his wits or merely his erring eyes? The questions affect his integrity as a scribe.

It is difficult to see what happened between Capell and his copy where certain of Habington's poems are concerned. This is his version of *Vpon CASTARA's frowne or smile* (f. 54^r):

[*No title.*]

Learned shade of Ticho brache who to us
The stars prophetique language didst impart
And even in life theire misteries discusse
For if Castara smile, though winter hath
Lockt up the rivers summers warme in me
And Flora by the miracle reviv'd;
But should she frowne, the northerne wind arriv'd
In midst of summer lends his frozen band
Which doth to ice my youthfull bloud conjeale
Yet in the midst still flames my zeale.
Her brighter soule would in the moone inspire
More chastity, in diſmer stars more fire.

If this is compared with the first printed version of 1634 it is found (1) that instead of being all of a piece the printed poem is made up of four parts, i.e., three separated quatrains and a couplet; (2) that Capell's version lacks ll. 4-6 and l. 10 of the printed poem; (3) that from l. 10 of Capell's version the words 'of ice' are lacking, perhaps by an error of haplography from the line above; and (4) that the final couplet in Capell does not belong to the printed poem, but to the poem next but one in the editions, *Vpon thought CASTARA may die*, of which it is ll. 3-4. What happened here one cannot say. The pranks may have been played deliberately, and if so by a cleverish hand: the final couplet sounds very well in Capell and was not a final couplet in its right place in Habington. Or, instead, Capell's version may represent an honest attempt to deal with a bad and tattered MS.

III.

In copying up the thirteen poems of Donne, Capell certainly found his source difficult. Like those of Carew and Habington, but unlike those of Browne, these thirteen are scattered singly or in twos or threes. There are no poems by Donne to be found in the second half of the MS. The scattering means that they were written at different times and may mean that they derive from different sources. It seems that Capell found certain passages beyond his skill in paleography, but that he attempted an accurate transcript, even at the cost of some nonsense. The source of his copy of *The Storme* and *The Calme* appears to have been badly torn, even fragmentary. In places he seems to be rescuing what he can. His tran-

script of *The Storme* is made up of ll. 25–8, 31–6, 41–6, 48 (the latter part only: ‘Some forth the cabbins peepe’)—50, 53–end, and his transcript of *The Calme* of ll. 7–14, 17–26, 29–32, 38 (the latter part only: ‘Our pinaces now [*above a cancelled* ‘no’] bead rid ships’), 49–50, 55–end. This fragmentary condition of some of his copy may indicate, as Professor Sisson has pointed out to me, that he had before him Donne’s autograph dilapidated with much handling and considered too precious to destroy. One would think that complete copies of *The Storme* and *The Calme* should have been easy to come by, even in the late 1640’s¹. If Capell’s transcript of these poems derives from autograph MSS., the *Epithalamion* ...on the Lady Elizabeth and Count Palatine may also have autograph source since it follows immediately after these in Capell.

The following is a list of Capell’s major variants. Many small differences of punctuation and hyphenating are not noted, nor instances which concern metrical elision, such as ‘he is’ for ‘he’s’ and *vice versa*, nor any of the obvious blunderings, e.g., ‘knockt’ for ‘knot’ at l. 56 of the *Epithalamion*, and ‘speare of her speare’ for ‘speare after speare’ at l. 81. Capell makes complete havoc of three or four passages: for instance, *Twickenam Garden* should end with

O perverse sexe, where none is true but shee,
Who’s therefore true, because her truth kills mee.

Capell for the first of these lines reads:

O purer sex what none is true but she.

I do not note the other examples. The line references are to Grierson’s edition and the letter G represents his text, though only at the essential points.

1. *The Storme* (19^v–20^r).

(a) ll. 48–50:

[*First part of line missing.*] Some forth the cabbins peepe
And aske the newes, & trembling do heare so
As jealous husbands, what they would not know.

G.: ‘their cabbins...And tremblingly’aske what newes, and doe heare so...’ (1635–69: ‘trembling.’)

(b) ll. 53–4:

Then note they the ships; sicknesse the mast
Shak’d with an ague....

G.: ‘ships sicknesses,...this ague.’

¹ The first group of Donne’s poems (*The Storme*, *The Calme* and the *Epithalamion*) come at the beginning of the poems which were written in Capell’s more developed hand. This may mean that they were copied down no later than the late 1640’s.

(c) ll. 61-4:

Pumping hath tir'd our men, & what's y^e gaine
 Seas in to seas throwne, we sinke in againe
 Hearing hath deaf'd our sailors, & if they
 Know how to heare, there's none knows w^t to say.

G.: 'we suck...knew...'

(d) ll. 66-7:

Darknesse [*first written* 'Barknesse'] lights eldest brother his birth right
 Clames ore the world, & th' heaven chas'd light;

G.: 'and to heaven hath chas'd light.'

2. *The Calme* (20^{r-v}).

(a) ll. 8-9:

Smoth as thy M^{rs} glasse, or what strives there:
 The sea is now;...

G: 'shines' for 'strives.'

(b) l. 17: 'No use for lanthornes,...'

G: 'of' for 'for.'

(c) ll. 19-20:

Earths hollownesses which y^e worlds lungs are,
 Have more wind than the upper vault of aire.

G: 'Have no more winde.'

3. *An Epithalamion, or marriage Song on the Lady Elizabeth, and Count Palatine being married on St. Valentines day* (20^v-22^v).

(a) l. 13: all the printed texts end this with a period. Grierson conjectured a comma. Capell has a comma.

(b) l. 50: 'You are twice inseparably great & one.'

G: 'You'are twice inseparable, great.'

(c) l. 54: 'And that you are all one by hearts & hands made fast'

G: 'you'are one.'

(d) l. 59: 'Staies he new light from hence to get?'

G: 'from these.'

(e) l. 79: 'And now shee's laid; what though she bee'

G: 'But now she is.'

(f) l. 84: 'The day was but the eve to this o Valentine'

G: 'Thy day.'

(g) l. 87: 'Or each is both or all & so'

G: 'both, and all.'

4. *A Valediction: forbidding mourning* (37^{r-v}).

(a) l. 6: 'No teare-floods, no sigh-tempests move'

G: 'nor sigh-tempests.'

(b) l. 20: 'Carelesse eyes, lipps or hands to misse [*first written 'kisse'*']'

G: 'and hands.'

5. *Breake of day* (39^v-40^r).

l. 2: 'O therefore wilt thou rise from me?'

G: 'O wilt thou therefore.'

6. *Twicknam garden* (40^{r-v}).(a) l. 1: 'Blasted with sight [*the 't' was added later*] & surrounded wth teares'

G: 'sighs.'

(b) l. 5: 'But o step-traitor I doe bring'

G: 'O, selfe traytor.'

(c) l. 25: 'Than by her shaddow that she weares.'

G: 'what' for 'that.'

7. *Elegie V. His Picture* (40^v-41^r).

No variant of importance.

8. *Elegie VI* (41^{r-v}).

(a) l. 1: 'O let me not serve as those men serve.'

G: 'serve so, as.'

(b) l. 20: 'Scarce visiting them that are intirely his.'

G: 'them, who.'

(c) ll. 21 ff.:

When I behold a streame w^{ch} from the spring
 Doth wth melodious doubtfull murmuring,
 Or in a speechlesse slumber calmely ride
 Hir¹ we wedded channells botton, & there chide
 And bend his boughs, and swell, if any bough
 Do but drop downe to kisse hir² utmost brow:
 Yet if her often knawing kisses winne
 The traitorous banks to gape, & let her in,
 She rusheth violently & doth divorce
 Her from her native, & her long kept course,
 And wears and braves it, & in gallant scorne,
 In flattering eddies promising returne,
 She flouts her channell w^{ch} thenseforth is dry;
 And say I that is shee, & this am I.

¹ Capell had difficulty with this word. He first wrote 'Her,' I think, converted this into 'His' and then into 'Hir.'

² Capell first wrote 'his,' probably.

G: l. 22: 'Doth with doubtfull melodious murmuring.'

ll. 24-5: 'Her wedded channels bosome, and then chide
And bend her browes....'

l. 31: 'And rores, and braves it....'

(d) At l. 40 Grierson conjectures a final period, which is the reading of Capell.

9. *Elegie I. Jealousie* (45^v-46^r).

(a) ll. 19-20: 'sate' riming with 'adulterate.' G: 'satt.'

(b) ll. 27-8:

But if as envious men which would revile
Theire Prine, & coine his gold....

G: 'Prince, or.'

(c) l. 33: 'As the inhabitance of Thames right side.'

G: 'inhabitants.'

10. *A Valediction: of weeping* (47^{r-v}).

ll. 17-18:

Till all thy teares mixt wth mine doe overflow
This world, by waters sent from thee (my heaven) dissolved so.

G: 'Till thy teares...thee, my heaven dissolved so.'

11. *The Baite* (47^v-48^r).

Capell made three slips into nonsense when transcribing this poem.

12. *Epitaph on Himselfe. To the Countesse of Bedford* (49^r).

(a) l. 5: 'Others by will give legacies but I.'

G: 'Wills.'

(b) ll. 11-12:

Yet th' art not so good; till us death lay
To ripe & mellow thee w' are stubborne clay;

G: 'Yet th' art not yet so good;...mellow there.'

In view of the different forms in which this poem exists, it may be noted that Capell follows the form represented in the printed texts of 1635-54, giving the introductory epistle, the first ten lines of the epitaph and the heading 'Elegy.'

13. *The Apparition* (53^v-54^r).

(a) l. 4: 'There shall my my ghoast come to thy bed.'

G: 'Then.'

(b) l. 12: 'Bath'd in a cold quicke silver'd sweat will lie.'

G: 'quicksilver sweat wilt lye.'

Where these variants are of more than small importance they come in difficult passages. *The Storme*, *The Calme*, the sixth Elegy are subtle poems, even for us to-day. Capell found them difficult to copy. He may have tried to make his own sense of what he thought was the reading of his copy. He may have worked in memorised units too large to ensure his not mixing words which, grammatically or metrically, were interchangeable members of one group—'that' and 'who,' 'that' and 'what,' 'she is' and 'she's.' He may, like any scribe, have dropped words or inserted words not in his original. He may have misread 'sucke' as 'sinke,' 'shines' as 'strives.' It seems that of all men scribes are most apt to human frailty. But it would have needed a finer ear probably than Capell's to manipulate the line 'Doth with doubtfull melodious murmuring,' and convert it into 'Doth with melodious doubtfull murmuring.' It may be that the ear was Donne's. Capell makes nonsense frequently enough to justify one's feeling that, when in a difficult passage he makes good sense, that sense may have been Donne's.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

THE MYSTERY OF 'THE STAGE COACH'

IN the Nonesuch edition of George Farquhar's works, Mr Charles Stonehill, the editor, reprints Farquhar and Motteux's farce, *The Stage Coach*, from the second edition of the play, as issued in London in 1705, and gives a list of the numerous variant readings it presents in both text and stage directions when collated with the original Dublin edition of 1704. It has not hitherto been observed that these variants, once they are scrutinised in conjunction with other evidence shortly to be specified, reveal the falsity of the accepted stage history of the play. The matter is one of exceptional intricacy, but it seems to me worth while taking pains to get at the heart of the mystery, seeing that it was the ultimate vogue of *The Stage Coach* which brought about the firm establishment of the principle of the afterpiece early in the eighteenth century.

In reprinting the farce, Mr Stonehill gives a prologue from (and peculiar to) the first London edition, which one is apt to infer—though erroneously—was spoken on the first production of the piece, and he gives also a second prologue, taken from Thomas Wilkes's edition of Farquhar's works published in Dublin in 1775. This second prologue bears heading '*A New Prologue / Spoken upon the Revival of this Comedy, at the Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, some Years since, when acted for the Benefit of the Author. Written by Mr Samuel Philips.*' Mr Stonehill likewise reproduces two epilogues, the first from the same source as the first prologue and like it liable to be mistaken for the original, and the second from Wilkes and certainly written for the revival already mentioned. The latter is entitled '*A New Epilogue / Spoken by Captain Basil. / Written by Mr Phillips.*' Though the point has no association with the present inquiry, it is worthy of note since the plagiarism has not been remarked that the first epilogue was stolen bodily from the prologue spoken on the revival of *The Careless Shepherdess* at Salisbury Court in 1638, only a word or two here and there being altered and a few lines omitted¹. For petty thefts of this kind there was, of course, an abundance of precedent.

Following Professor Allardyce Nicoll's dating, Mr Stonehill states in his introduction and elsewhere that *The Stage Coach* was first produced at the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre, as an afterpiece to *The Country Wit*, on February 2, 1704, and acted then, in all, ten times. There is, however,

¹ See my article on 'The Authorship of *The Careless Shepherdess*' in *The Times Literary Supplement* of July 24, 1924.

good reason to believe that this was not the first production of the farce but merely a revival, and, in all probability, the revival for which the first prologue and epilogue were written. In the prologue not a word is said about the play or its author, let alone about its being new; and in the slightly adapted epilogue there is actually a reference to the 'farce' (note the alteration) as having been previously acted. That the play dates from an earlier period than the one assigned to it is indicated by the fact that a reference to it occurs in Motteux's prologue to Farquhar's *The Inconstant*, as originally written to be spoken at Drury Lane in March, 1702, though not delivered, it would appear, *verbatim et literatim*. This address is a prolonged simile, and opens thus:

Like hungry guests a sitting Audience looks:
Plays are like Suppers: Poets are the Cooks.
The Founders you; The Table is this Place.
The Carvers, We; The Prologue is the Grace.

Pursuing this strain, Motteux writes a little later on:

An Op'ra, like an Olio, nicks the Age;
Farce is the Hasty-pudding of the Stage.
For when you're treated with indifferent Cheer,
Ye can dispense with slender Stage-Coach fare.
A Pastorall's Whipt Cream; Stage-Whim's, meer Trash;
And Tragicomedy, half Fish, half Flesh.

Here the reference to 'Stage-Coach fare' in association with farce would be utterly meaningless, unless it can be taken as a glancing allusion to the play. We must bear in mind that *The Stage Coach* was styled a farce when originally published in Dublin, though afterwards called a comedy on the title-page of the London variant.

When, then, did the little piece receive its first production? On that score, we can do no more than speculate, and, in risking an hypothesis, I do so with some trepidation. *Sir Harry Wildair*, Farquhar's sequel to *The Constant Couple*, was brought out at Drury Lane in April, 1701, and was given then nine times. For a five-act comedy, it is remarkably short. In the Nonesuch edition it occupies fourteen pages less than its predecessor occupies, a shortage equivalent to an entire act. (By a curious coincidence, *The Stage Coach* takes up exactly fourteen pages.) Might it not have been that when the play was put into rehearsal, it was found insufficient for a whole evening's entertainment, and that, by way of repairing the fault Farquhar and Motteux hastily adapted *The Stage Coach* from the French, to eke out the deficiency? Though not wholly unknown, afterpieces were so uncommon at this period that the farce is not likely to have been written except under pressure, and to serve some particular purpose. If produced in association with *Sir Harry Wildair*,

the probabilities are that it had no individual prologue or epilogue. When Otway's *Titus and Berenice* and *The Cheats of Scapin* were produced together at Dorset Garden late in 1676, a single prologue and a single epilogue were made to do duty for both.

The first prologue in Mr Stonehill's reprint of *The Stage Coach* borrows a few lines from Farquhar's prologue to Oldmixon's *The Grove*, an opera produced at Drury Lane on February 19, 1700. It is unlikely that a repetition of this kind would have taken place within fourteen months, and it is consequently safer to connect the first prologue and epilogue with the Lincoln's Inn Fields revival of 1704. The cast in the first London edition of the play is certainly one of the Lincoln's Inn Fields company at that period. All the evidence is against the assumption that the performances of 1704 mark the first production of the farce. In the advertisement of the play, as transcribed in the Latreille MSS. in the British Museum, it is not announced as 'never acted,' as new plays then invariably were, but as 'the last new farce.'

The variant texts remain to be accounted for. To my mind, what happened was somewhat as follows. When Farquhar left for Dublin, in, say, March, 1704, shortly after being given a lieutenancy in Orrery's regiment of foot, he took with him the original script of *The Stage Coach*, possibly with the intention of having it acted at Smock Alley, but more probably as a present to his brother, the Castle Street bookseller, who eventually published it. But, so far from there being any evidence of its performance in Ireland at that time, the silence of the first edition on the point renders it highly improbable. I take it that that edition was printed from the original script mainly because the list of *dramatis personae* is slovenly presented, initials only being given in two cases instead of characters' names. The absence of a prologue and epilogue and a cast is likewise significant. The attribution solely to Farquhar on the title-page draws attention to the fact that the only authority for Motteux's collaboration in the play is the compiler (whether Whincop or another) of the *Compleat List of all the English Dramatic Poets*, published in 1747. Motteux's contribution was probably no more than the solitary song which occurs early in the play. The discrepancies in the more formal edition issued in London a few months later are best accounted for by the supposition that its text and stage directions were derived from the recently used (and possibly original) prompt book. Some unexplainable mystery attaches itself, however, to the turgid, unsigned dedication peculiar to this imprint. It does not strike me as Farquhar's (he commonly signed all epistles of the sort); and it reads as if emanating rather

from a publisher's pen than an author's. If in this I err egregiously, it remains for someone more percipient to explain what was 'the piece' of Farquhar's 'lately publish't, which, because it looked upon all with an Impartial Eye, and (remote from servile Flattery) spared not nearest Relations, taxing not their persons but their Vices,' was 'hated for speaking Truth.'

One sympathises heartily with Mr Stonehill over the worries he experienced when editing Farquhar. No sooner had he accepted the proffered date of February, 1704, for the original production of *The Stage Coach* than he found himself impaled on the horns of a dilemma. Since it could not be made to tally with the statement placed at the head of the second (and it must be admitted, very belatedly printed) prologue, he had no option, in the circumstances, but to repudiate the accuracy of that statement. He saw full well that there was no chance of a subsequent revival of the farce at Lincoln's Inn Fields during Farquhar's lifetime, for Betterton's company deserted that house shortly after the opening of Vanbrugh's new theatre in the Haymarket, and it was there, in November, 1705, that the next revival of the farce took place. In this, he arrived at the right conclusion by wrong reasoning. I hope now to show that the prologue and epilogue derived from Wilkes are genuine enough, that the statement at the head of the prologue is genuine enough, but that neither address was written for delivery in association with any performance of the original farce. To do this is to relieve Farquhar's memory from the stigma attached to the *ad misericordiam* appeal so gravely made in the prologue on behalf of 'the half-starv'd poet.'

After having done excellent stage service for some years subsequent to Farquhar's death, *The Stage Coach* acquired new vitality at the hand of some anonymous poetaster by being converted into a ballad opera. Concerning, however, the origin of the ballad opera there is a mystery difficult to fathom. Seemingly, it was first produced in Dublin, and would appear therefore to have been the work of an Irish author. My first trace of it is on April 2, 1730, when, under the old title, it was acted at the Smock Alley Theatre for the joint benefit of the Widow Eastham and Mr Le Roux, the box-keeper. No further performance of the piece took place there until May 13, 1731, when, according to the advertisement, it was given for the second time on any stage for Griffith the actor's benefit. It was then described as 'altered after the manner of *The Beggar's Opera*, with gentle and humorous songs, properly adapted to old English, Scotch and Irish tunes.' The curious thing is, however, that a ballad opera entitled *The Stage Coach* was performed at Drury Lane on May 13,

1730, or within six weeks of the Dublin production, for Chetwood the bookseller-prompter's benefit. It seems hardly likely that the two were independent productions, or that, within so short a period, the one inspired the other, and the only way out of the difficulty is to assume that both were the same, and that, some little time before the first Dublin performance, the ballad opera had been originally produced in London. In the advertisement of Chetwood's benefit, it is not announced as precisely new¹. The performance was to begin with the tragedy of *Timoleon*, followed by some singing and dancing, 'to which will be added, *The Stage Coach*, with new songs to old ballad tunes and Country dances. The part of Jolt the Coachman by Mr James Excel, being the first time of his appearance upon any stage.' From the fact that 'a new Epilogue spoke by a Girl 5 years old' was also promised, it would appear that the ballad opera was not then precisely new.

But, whether or not the Irish and English productions were the same, I am enabled to throw some light on the authorship of the Drury Lane piece. Hitherto, it has been common belief among theatrical historians that *The Stage Coach* in its ballad opera form was never printed. Were I disposed to point the finger of scorn at Mr Stonehill for saying as much, my hand would be stayed by the humiliating circumstance that I myself once upon a time committed myself on the point in cold print². Conceive of my amazement (and gratification) on finding during a recent examination of the old Dublin edition of Farquhar's works that Wilkes had actually printed the book of the ballad opera, in all good faith, as the literal text of the original farce. Beyond the insertion of fifteen new songs to old ballad airs, no alteration is to be noted. The text was doubtless derived from a Dublin prompt-book, and the chances are that Wilkes, though long an ardent playgoer, had never seen the original version played. Not otherwise can one account for the blunder.

Once I had grasped that through pure mischance Wilkes had substituted the text of the ballad opera for the text of the original, the truth began to dawn upon me regarding the prologue and epilogue he had associated with it. Undeniably both were written for some benefit performance of the ballad opera, and 'the half-starv'd author' spoken of at the close of the prologue, so far from being Farquhar, was simply the writer of the added songs. Happily, the memoir of Farquhar prefixed to the old Dublin edition of his works affords us a clue to this writer's identity. We are told that, after Farquhar's death, *The Stage Coach* was

¹ Cited in the Latreille MSS., but the source not mentioned.

² See my article on 'Early Irish Ballad Opera and Comic Opera' in *The Musical Quarterly* for July, 1922.

revived at Lincoln's Inn Fields with additional songs 'by the late John Chetwood' and acted eighteen nights. As no John Chetwood figures in eighteenth-century dramatic annals, the name is probably a slip for William Rufus Chetwood, the noted old prompter-bookseller-author, who is known to have perpetrated one or two other ballad operas, and is otherwise remarkable for having spent a not inconsiderable portion of his life in jail for debt. We have already seen that a ballad opera called *The Stage Coach* was played for his benefit at Drury Lane in 1730, and there can be little doubt that the prologue and epilogue which Wilkes has preserved were written for some later benefit performance on his behalf. It is on record that the ballad opera was given at the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre on April 29, 1736, and that possibly might have been the occasion.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

LONDON.

NOTES ON THE POEMS OF BERTRAN DE BORN¹

I.

In these notes the text is quoted, except when otherwise specified, according to the latest edition of the poems of Bertran de Born, that of C. Appel (*Die Lieder Bertrams von Born*; Halle, 1932), which, it may be recalled, contains a glossary and the more important variants, but no commentary. The pieces are dealt with in the order in which they appear in that edition.

1. LOVE SONGS.

Song 1. Contained in MSS. ACC²DD^cEFIKMR.

Imitated, as regards the form at least, by the Monk of Montaudon in his *enueg*: *Be m'enoia s'o auzes dire*. Cp. Maus, pp. 19-20.

There is no warrant for placing, as Appel does, this piece first chronologically among the love songs, to which category it does not properly belong, any more than his No. 6, though they are connected by the author of the *Razos* with Bertran's supposed adventures in love. It may

¹ **BIBLIOGRAPHY.** M. Raynouard, *Lexique roman*, Paris, 1844; quoted as *LR*. A. Stimming, *Bertran de Born: sein Leben und seine Werke*, Halle, 1879; quoted as Stimming¹. L. Clédât, *Du Rôle historique de Bertrand de Born*, Paris, 1879. K. Bartsch, review of Stimming¹ in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, III, 1879, pp. 409-27. A. Thomas, review of Clédât and of Stimming¹ in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, XL, 1879, pp. 471-8. H. Suchier, review of Stimming¹ in *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Phil.*, 1880, cols. 140-4. C. Chabaneau, review of Stimming¹ in *Revue des langues romanes*, XXXI, 1887, pp. 603-11. A. Thomas, *Poésies complètes de Bertran de Born*, Toulouse, 1888. C. Chabaneau, review of Thomas in *Revue des langues romanes*, XXXII, 1888, pp. 200-8. E. Levy, review of Thomas in *Literaturblatt*, 1890, cols. 228-35. H. Andresen, review of Thomas in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XIV, 1890, pp. 185-218. A. Stimming, *Bertran von Born*, Halle, 1892; quoted as Stimming². A. Thomas, review of Stimming² in *Romania*, XXII, 1893, pp. 590 ff. H. Andresen, explanation of a few passages, in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XVIII, 1894, pp. 268-70. E. Levy, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch* (continued by C. Appel), Leipzig, 1894-1924; quoted as *SW*. P. Boissonnade, *Les comtes d'Angoulême. Les ligues féodales contre Richard Cœur de Lion et les poésies de Bertran de Born*, in *Annales du Midi*, VII, pp. 275-95. E. Levy, *Petit dictionnaire Provençal-Français*, Heidelberg; quoted as *PD*. S. Stroński, *Le Troubadour Folquet de Marseille*, Cracovie, 1910. A. Stimming, *Bertran von Born*, Halle, 1913; quoted as Stimming³. H. Andresen, review of Stimming³ in *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, XLII, 1914, pp. 39-42. O. Schultze-Gora, review of Stimming³ in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, XIII, 1914, pp. 1175-7. S. Stroński, *La Légende amoureuse de Bertran de Born*, Paris, 1914. K. Lewent, review of Stimming³ in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CXXXIII, 1915, pp. 215 ff. A. Kolsen, review of Stimming³ in *Literaturblatt*, 1919, cols. 388-92. E. Levy, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Bertran de Born*, I, in *Archiv*, CXLII, 1921, pp. 265-70; II, *ibid.*, CXLIII, 1922, pp. 89-98; III, *ibid.*, CXLIV, 1922, pp. 92-100. C. Appel, *Beiträge zur Textkritik der Lieder Bertrams von Born*, I, in *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Berlin, 1929, pp. 233-63; II, *ibid.*, 1930, pp. 33-64; quoted as *Beiträge*. C. Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie*, 6th edition, Leipzig, 1930; quoted as *Chrest.*⁶ C. Appel, *Bertran von Born*, Halle, 1931. J. Storost, *Ursprung und Entwicklung des altprovenzalischen Sirventes bis auf Bertran de Born*, Halle, 1931. C. Appel, *Die Lieder Bertrams von Born*, Halle, 1932; quoted as *Lieder*.

be mentioned in this connexion that, in attempting to determine the date of Bertran's love songs, I have relied exclusively on the facts contained in the songs themselves and neglected the highly-coloured and romantic story as related by the author of the *Razos*, whose account of Bertran's love adventures will not bear examination, as S. Stroński has proved in his penetrating study on *La Légende amoureuse de Bertran de Born*, Paris, 1914. As the present piece is addressed to Rassa, Bertran's *senhal* for Geoffrey of Brittany, all we can say then, leaving out of consideration the information supplied by the *Razo*, is that it must have been composed before the death of that prince (19. 8. 1186).

1, 1-11

Rassa, tan creis e monta e poia
 Cela qu'es de totz enjans voia:
 Sos pretz a las autras enoia,
 Qu'una no·i a que ren i noia,
 5 Que·l vezers de sa beutat loia
 Los pros a sos ops, cui que coia;
 Que·lh plus conoissen e·lh melhor
 Mantenon ades sa lauzor
 E la tenon per la genzor,
 10 Qu'ilh sap far tan entieir' onor:
 No vol mas un sol pregador.

Replace *a las autras* (v. 3) by *qu'a las melhors* of all the eleven MSS., except AM. In that case *Sos pretz* is the subject to *creis e monta e poia* and *Cela* is a dative, according to a well-known construction. The word-for-word translation would then be (with the deletion of the colon after *voia*): 'Rassa, so much increases and mounts and ascends to her who is devoid of all deceit her merit that this vexes the best (ladies).' Cp. the reading *de leis* of MR in lieu of *cela*. In Appel's text *Cela* is the subject and there is parataxis (indicated throughout in his text by a colon) after *voia* instead of after *pretz*. Despite the MS. tradition, it does not necessarily follow that Appel's version should be rejected; and I ought perhaps to state at the outset, here again, that, contrary to the common practice in vogue since Lachmann's day, I do not attach much importance to the genealogical trees of the MSS. in general. (These will be found in Stimming's first edition.) Bédier has shown, conclusively to my mind, in his recent masterly reflections on the art of editing old texts (*Romania*, April-July-October, 1928), that, of the various MS. readings, it is often impossible to decide which was regarded as definitive by the author. The troubadours like any other poets revised and touched up their productions, and when the MSS. present different readings more than one of these may have emanated from the author.

In v. 5, as Appel (*Beiträge*, II, 37) points out, the force of *loia* is ruined by a colourless word like 'gewinnen' (Stimming³) or 'attirer' (Thomas);

loiar should be rendered literally by 'prendre à louage' (PD.), 'in Sold nehmen' (*Lieder*, Gloss.): all men who behold her beauty are eager to become soldiers in her service (*a sos ops*). In v. 10 *Qu'ilh sap* is in A only (*qu'il sap*), to which both Stimming and Appel appear to me to give undue weight; the better reading is *E sap* of all the other MSS., except M and R, which show *gar il* and *mas ilh* respectively.

1, 12-17

Rassa, domn' ai qu'es frescha e fina,
Coinda e gaia e mesquina:
Pel saur, ab color de robina,
15 Blancha pel cors com flors d'espina,
Coude mól ab dura tetina,
E sembla conil de l'esquina.

Appel is right in supplying a comma (omitted by Stimming and Thomas) after *saur* (v. 14), as the rest of the verse does not refer to the lady's golden hair, but to her complexion, likened to the colour of the ruby, which gem, it should be remembered, although usually deep red, is found in varying shades of pink. Thus Audiau's translation ('elle a des cheveux roux, couleur de rubis,' *Nouvelle Anthologie des Troubadours*, p. 141) gives quite a false impression; as does also his rendering of the last verse ('et ses reins ont la souplesse d'un lapin'), in which Bertran compares the hollow of the back of the lady to the back of a rabbit, not because of her litheness, nor, as Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 89, note) will have it, on account of her delicate slimness, but because that part of her body is soft and downy like the fur of that animal. Place also a comma after *mól* (v. 16).

1, 23-24

Rassa, als rics es orgolhosa,
E fai gran sen a lei de tosa.

A lei de tosa offers difficulties which Levy (*SW.*, toza 2) has pointed out without solving them. The meaning seems to be: she shows disdain for the rich, and in so doing she acts sensibly, as a young woman should.

1, 30-33

Prec li que tenha char s'amor
Et am mais un pro vavassor
Qu'un comte o duc galiador
Que la tengues a desonor.

For *tener char* Stimming's 'in Ehren halten' should give way to Thomas' 'conserver précieusement' and to Appel's 'werthalten,' 'hochhalten' (*Lieder*, Gloss.). In v. 32 read *Que* in lieu of *Qu'un* with all the MSS., except A. In the last verse *tengues* appears in A only, so read *menes* with all the other MSS., except MR which have *tornes*.

1, 34-44

Rassa, rics hom que re no dona
35 Ni acuolh ni met ni no sona
E que senes tort ochaisona
E, qui merce·lh quier, no perdona,

M'enoia, e tota persona
 Que servizi no guizerdona.
 40 E li ric ome chassador
 M'enoian e·lh buzacador
 Gaban de volada d'austor
 (Ni ja mais d'armas ni d'amor
 No parlaran mot entre lor).

In v. 35 adopt *Ni honra ni acuelh ni sona* of all the MSS. except A, and in v. 37 *E qui·l quier merce* which has much stronger MS. support than Appel's reading. *Gaban* (v. 42) can be taken either with Stimming³ and Andresen (*Zeit. rom. Ph.*, xiv, p. 205) in the sense of 'to make fun of' or in that of 'to boast.' The former seems preferable on the whole, in the light of what follows: those who use for hawking, instead of the falcon or hawk, the buzzard, an inferior bird for that purpose (cp. note to 29, 14), make fun of the flight of the superior goshawk and pretend to look down on it because they have not the skill to handle that more spirited bird. In the same way they are equally hopeless as regards fighting and love-making which they never mention and which demand qualities they do not possess. In the last verse for *No parlaran* substitute *Non parlar' om*, backed by the majority of the better MSS.

1, 53-55 E·l vescoms defenda s'onor,
 E·l coms deman la·lh per vigor,
 E veiam l'ades al pascor.

Levy (*Litblatt*, 1890, col. 233) is puzzled by the last verse ('And may we see him already in the spring') which seems to refer to Richard (*lo coms*), then count of Poitiers, who, as the previous verse indicates, was then at war with his old foe, Ademar V (*lo vescoms*), viscount of Limoges. This at all events is how the author of the *Razo* understood the passage: *E volia que·l coms Richartz guerreies lo vescomte de Lemotges e que·l vescoms si defendes proosamen*.

1, 61-62 Papiols, mon chantar recor
 En la cort mo mal Bel-Senhor.

In this tornada, found, in an imperfect form, in CEM only, *recor* can only come from *recorre*; but it is very doubtful whether *recorre* can be used as a transitive verb, and, if so, whether the meaning 'bringen' (Stimming³) or 'befördern' (Andresen, *Zeit. rom. Ph.*, xiv, p. 206) can be read into it. The instances of other verbs of motion used factitively quoted by Andresen do not appear to be parallel cases. Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxi, p. 610) and Thomas (p. 106) accordingly propose to emend to *mos chantars recor* (= *recurrat*). In that case the reading of C (*lai on es*), instead of *En la cort* of M (this part of the verse is wanting in E), seems the better: 'Papiol, my song runs back there where is my

wicked Bel-Senhor,' or (with *recor* as the imperative): 'Papiol, let my song run back,' etc.

Song 2. Contained in MSS. FIK.

The mention of Guischarde in the last verse (*Puois na Guischarde nos es sai tramesa*) and the first five verses (see below) leave no doubt that this song, which exists in a fragmentary form only, was written to celebrate the arrival, in Limousin, of Guischarde de Beaujeu in Burgundy. She married Archambaut of Comborn in Limousin who succeeded to the viscounty, as Archambaut VI, between 1184 and 1187 (cp. Stroński, *Légende*, pp. 62 ff.). Guischarde's arrival in Limousin, and also probably her marriage to Archambaut, must have taken place before his accession to the viscounty of Comborn, as she is mentioned, under the pseudonym 'Mielhs-de-Be,' in the *domna soisseubuda* (Appel's No. 5, v. 47), which (see below) was written before the autumn or early winter of 1182. It follows that the date (1185) proposed by Stroński (*op. cit.*, p. 97) for the composition of the present song is a good deal too late.

2, 1-5

Ai! Lemozis, francha terra cortesa,
Mout mi sap bo quar tals honors vos creis,
Que jois e pretz e deportz e gaiesa,
Cortesia e solatz e domneis
5 S'en ve a nos. El cor estej' anceis!

In v. 5 Stimming³ adopts the emendation (*S'en ve a nos, o-l cors estet anceis*;) suggested tentatively by Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxi, p. 604), except that he changes unnecessarily *cor* of the MSS. to *cors*: 'where (i.e., in Limousin) the heart (of Guischarde) was before (already).' Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 38) proposes to adhere, as above, to the reading of F, which is: *el cor estei anceis*, and to translate, with a full stop after *nos* and an exclamation mark after *anceis*: 'in the heart (i.e., in our hearts) may they (*Jois e Pretz*, etc.) be already!' (i.e., before Guischarde's arrival in Limousin), in such wise that her admirers may be able to greet her in their land by the display of the qualities she typifies. The singular verb *estei* (or if one prefers *estei'* or *estej'*) after several singular subjects (IK have the more regular *esteian*, which however gives one syllable too many) need not give rise to any doubts, in view especially of *ve* in the same verse. An improvement, I submit, entailing the change of one letter only, would be to read *estes*, instead of *estei*, with Appel's punctuation: 'would that they (*Jois e Pretz*, etc.) had been in our hearts before!' (i.e., would that we had not had to await the arrival of lady Guischarde to see these virtues among us). Would it not also be possible to read, adhering to the version of F, with a semi-colon after *nos*, and with

el = *e lo* : *e . l cor estei anc eis* ! : 'and may the heart (the heart of Guischarde) itself ever remain there!' (i.e., in Limousin)?

2, 8-9 Dos e servirs e guarnirs e larguesa
Noiris amor, com fai l'aiga los peis.

Guarnirs, as the context shows, should not be interpreted literally with Stimming³, but in the more general sense of 'display.' Retain, as Stimming does, *amors* of the MSS. (the plural of that word is frequently used with the value of the singular), which Thomas corrects unnecessarily to *amor* and which Appel (*Lieder*, p. 6) queries. On the other hand *los peis* of Stimming³ and Appel should give way to *lo peis* of IK.

2, 12-14 E, qui pros es ni de proeza . s feis,
Mal estara, s'aoras no pareis,
Puois na Guischarda nos es sai tramesa.

In v. 13 I understand *estar* as the impersonal verb and *qui* in the previous line as merely a spelling for *cui* (cp. *Rev. langues rom.*, XIX, p. 61, and *Romania*, II, p. 162): 'and it shall become him ill who is noble and prided himself on his nobility, if that does not now appear, since lady Guischarde has been sent to us here.' On *se fenher d'alcuna re* see the note to 23, 9.

Song 3. Contained in MSS. FGIKd.

We may conclude from vv. 11-12:

Lemozi, be vos deu plazer
Qu'ara . us es vengutz Mielhs-de-Be

that this piece also refers to the arrival of Guischarde de Beaujeu among the people of Limousin, and that it was written soon after Appel's No. 2, before the autumn or early winter of 1182.

3, 9-10 Qu'enves me no . s pot escondire,
Qu'al sieu tort no . m dones lezer.

In these puzzling verses which Levy (*SW.*, *escondir* 4) discusses, without however reaching any definite conclusion, I would delete the comma after *escondire* and take *se escondire* in the well-attested sense of 'to deny one's guilt': 'car envers moi elle ne peut nier qu'elle ne me donnât injustement congé.' This is apparently how the author of the *Razo* understood the passage: *ela . l partit de se e det li comjat et encusava lo de ma domna Guischarda*.

3, 13 Tan com mars clau ni terra te.

Com occurs in F only and should not be preferred to *quant(can)* of the other MSS. Cp. B. de Ventadorn (ed. Appel, 24, 24): *tan quan te terra ni dura*; Pistoleta (ed. Niestroy, p. 30, v. 20): *que non a par en tan quan lo mons te*; *Flamenca*², vv. 30, 31: *Meller cavalliers non pot cener*

Espaza tan quan dura·l monz. For *tener* in the sense of 'to reach,' 'extend,' associated with *claire*, cp. *G. de Roussillon*, v. 5108: *en aitan con te lo mons Ne la mars clau.* For numerous examples, in OF as well as in OP, of this use of *tener*, see Tobler in *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1885, pp. 941 ff.

3, 16

No·i a joi qui de lieis no·l te.

Instead of *No·i* read *Non* with Thomas and place a comma after *joi*: 'there is no joy, if one...'

3, 21-25

Aquesta vos dic que mante
 Pretz e joi (tan aman onor,
 Joven e solatz et amor)
 Et acuelh, dona e rete

25 Grat de totz cels que si conve.

All five MSS. appear to have *aman* in v. 22, which Stimming³ interprets as *ama·n*. Thomas writes *ama*, in spite of the MSS. The *·n* in Stimming's version seems to refer vaguely to the fact that the lady in question upholds *Pretz* and *Joi*. Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 39), not satisfied with this, sees in *aman* a present participle and places in brackets (as above) the words from *tan* inclusive to *amor*. Neither the reading of Stimming³ nor that of Appel can be said to carry conviction. Thomas' text, except that he drops the *n* of *aman* and puts a comma after *amor*, does not differ from that of Stimming³. All three take *acuelh* as a verb. I submit that *acuelh* should be understood as a noun, and, in addition, that *dona* (v. 24) should be written *don a*, in two words, with a semi-colon before *don*: 'I tell you that this lady upholds Merit and Joy, so much does she love on that account honour, youthfulness and pleasure and love and hospitality; wherefore she gains and earns the gratitude of all those,' etc. For *aver grat* and *retener grat*, which are equivalent, see *SW.* (*grat* 12 and 16). One could, of course, also adopt Appel's suggestion with regard to *aman* and extend the bracket to include *acuelh* (as a noun); but the important point is that *dona* should be read as two words (*don a*).

3, 51-54

Giulhelme, a Torena vai dire
 A'n Bos, que·s chaptenha tan be
 Qu'om puoscha d'uoï enan dire eslire
 Que Amors de son joi l'estre.

From the mention of Torena we may conclude that *Bos* is Boso III, eldest son of Raymond II, viscount of Turenne, who succeeded his father in 1191 (Stroński, *Légende*, p. 159). As his father was born in 1143, Boso must have been quite young when Bertran wrote the present piece; so that Chabaneau's rendering of *eslire* (the meaning is doubtful) by 'deviner,' 'prédire' (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxi, p. 604) suits the context better than 'erkennen' (Stimming³, and Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.).

Song 4. Contained in MSS. ABCDEFIKRT.

This piece supplies no clue which might help to assign to it even an approximate date.

4, 1-2 Ieu m'escondisc, domna, que mal no mier
De so que·us an de me dich lauzengier.

Verse 2 could be made to depend on *ieu m'escondisc*, in which case of course a comma would have to be inserted at the end of the first verse.

4, 5. *Umil e franc*: *franc* here should not be rendered by 'edle' (Stimming³ and Appel) or by 'noble' (Thomas), but by 'affable,' 'gracious,' 'kindly' (cp. note to 23, 21). In this sense *umil* is often associated with *franc* (see *SW.*, *umil* 3).

4, 7-8 Al·premier get perd' ieu mon esparvier,
Que·l m'aucian el ponh falco lanier.

The falcons whose bodies were covered with woolly down (*lanarius*) were considered ill-fitted for hawking. Among the various disagreeable things which Bertran wishes may befall him, he prays that he may lose his hawk in such a way that worthless falcons, jealous of his good bird, shall kill it while it is still on his fist, ready for the first cast.

4, 19-24 S'ieu per jogar m'asset pres del taulier,
20 Ja no·i puoscha baratar un denier
Ni ab 'taula presa' no puoscha entrar,
Anz get ades lo reir-azar derrier,
S'ieu autra domna deman ni enquier
Mas vos, cui am e desir e tenh char.

In a learned excursus (*Beiträge*, II, pp. 42-6) on *baratar* and its derivatives Appel shows that the meaning of the word here is 'to borrow,' and that Stimming's 'gewinnen' and Thomas' 'gagner au jeu' are untenable. With regard to the next verse he observes that he has placed *taula presa* in inverted commas because he understands these words as an exclamation by means of which the winner announces his victory; but he adds that to ascertain the precise meaning of this and other expressions referring to games played on a board requires a fuller knowledge than we possess of the rules governing these games in the Middle Ages. Both Stimming and Thomas see a distinct reference to the game of backgammon or 'tables,' as it was called till the seventeenth century (*taulas* or *jocs de taulas* in OP), in which the men or pieces are moved according to the throw of the dice. Both understand *taula* in the sense of 'man' or 'piece,' without, however, vouchsafing any further explanation. With *taula* in that sense the literal rendering is: 'may I not be able to enter the game with a captured piece.' The captured piece in that case is the man which, because it was covered by

one man only, has been hit and removed from the 'point' or compartment, and placed on the bar between the two tables which constitute the board in backgammon, its place being taken by the man which has captured it and thrown it out of the game, till the dice turn up a number corresponding to an open point on the adversary's table. This explanation assumes that Stimming and Thomas are right in ascribing to *taula* the signification they do, for which I can find no parallel (cp. *SW.*, *taula* 4). Always assuming that the rules of the game have not been greatly modified since the Middle Ages, there is more to be said for taking *taula* in the sense of 'table,' not forgetting that the backgammon board consists, as we have already pointed out, of two parts or 'tables,' on each of which are twelve 'points' or compartments, the meaning being then: 'may I not be able to re-enter the game with one of my pieces, all the points in my opponent's table being "taken" or covered (by two pieces), which makes them unassailable.' In the next verse the *reirazar* or 'back-throw' is the throw of the dice as a result of which a player is obliged to take up a man and to go back, i.e., re-enter at the table the man came from. Hence it constitutes a bad throw, and as the word is reinforced by *derrier* (cp. the use of *dernier* in French) *lo reirazar derier* is the worst of bad throws.

In v. 23 Thomas reads *S'autra domna mais deman ni enquier* by dropping *ieu* of the MSS., and introducing *mais* lacking in DFIK only (the whole strophe is missing in CE). The reading of Appel (and Stimming³), however, seems preferable, as throughout the piece there is insistence on the *ieu* which in all cases (cp. vv. 10, 15, 19, 30, 37) is expressed with the first person of the verb after *si*.

4, 25

Senher sia ieu de chastel parzonier.

See *SW.*, vi, 90-1, where the various conjectures are set forth. I agree with those (Diez, Levy, Jeanroy, Appel, *Lieder*, etc.) who think that *parzonier* qualifies *chastel* and that it is here equivalent to OF *parçonier*, 'commun,' 'mitoyen.' Stimming³ objects (p. 200) that one cannot be the lord of a castle held in common with another; he fails to see that Bertran is speaking ironically.

4, 31-32

Ma domna-m lais per autre chevalier,
E puous. no sai a que, m'aia mestier.

The MSS. (except T which has *ren* for *puois* and *que mi aia* for *a que*, *m'aia*) read *e pois non sai a* (or *saia*) *que maia mestier*, which Stimming¹ adopts. Stimming² writes *sapch' a que*. Stimming³ in the text adheres to his original reading, but in his notes (p. 200) prefers *sapcha*. Thomas prints *sai a que* in the text, which he corrects to *sapcha* in the Addenda.

Lastly Appel (*Chrest.*⁶, p. 76, and *Lieder*, as above), like Stimming¹, adheres to the reading of the MSS. But as Chabaneau remarks in his review of Stimming¹ (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxi, p. 606) the subjunctive is indispensable, and *saja* for *sapcha*, or *sapcha*, should be adopted: 'and then may I not know what may be of any service to me.'

4, 37-42

Domna, s'ieu ai mon auster anedier
Bel e mudat, be prenden e mainier,
Que tot auzel puoscha apoderar,
40 Cinh' e grua et aigro blanc e nier,
Volrai lo donc mal mudat, galinier,
Gort, debaten, que no puoscha volar?

The exact meaning of *galinier* (v. 41), derived from *galina*, is doubtful. Stimming³ and Thomas render it by 'Hühner jagend' and 'qui court après les poules' respectively, and Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) by 'der auf Hühner stößt'; Jeanroy (*Anthologie des Troubadours*, p. 40) prefers 'timide comme une poule.' In the next verse nearly all the MSS. write *gras*, adopted by Stimming³ and Thomas. Appel (*Chrest.*⁶, p. 76, and *Lieder*, as above) decides in favour of *gort*, probably because it is the *lectio difficilior*, according to C (*guort*), F (*grot*) and T (*guortz*). There is a good deal to be said for omitting, with Jeanroy (*Anthologie*, p. 40), the ? after *volar*, especially if the reading *volria lo* of AB (DIK have *volria lo done*) is accepted. The omission of the question mark has the advantage of not interrupting the series of unpleasant experiences which Bertran wishes may happen to him: 'dame, quand je verrai mon entour... capable de maîtriser toute proie...je veux bien qu'on vienne me le changer contre un autre, mal mué, timide comme une poule, gras, rétif, incapable de voler' (Jeanroy).

Song 5. Contained in MSS. ABDFIK.

Of the various ladies enumerated in this piece *Cembeli* and *Bel-Senher* are mentioned in the second strophe of *Ges de disnar* (Appel's No. 7), where Bertran expresses his intention of leaving Normandy for Limousin in order to take leave of these two beauties, so that he may devote himself entirely to his new mistress, the Duchess of Saxony. *Ges de disnar*, we know, was written in the autumn or early winter of 1182 (see below). It follows that the present song was composed before that date, but after Appel's Nos. 2 and 3, as *Mielhs-de-Be* (Guischarde de Beaujeu) is mentioned in the present piece (v. 47).

The idea of forming a composite lady who should combine in her person the good points of a number of other ladies is not original. A similar device, but of physical charms only, is attributed to the famous painter

Zeuxis by Cicero (*De Inventione*, 11, 1) and in a somewhat different form by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, xxxv, 9, 64): 'when he (Zeuxis) should make a table with a picture for the Agrigentines... he would needs see all the maidens of the citie, naked; and from all the companie hee chose five of the fairest to take out as from severall patterns whatsoever he liked best in any of them, and of all the lovely parts of those five, to make one bodie of incomparable beautie' (Holland's translation). Bertran's *domna soisseubuda*, it may be mentioned, inspired another troubadour, Elias de Barjols, some ten years later, to employ the same artifice in order to compose an ideal knight or *cavalier benestan* as he calls him; and among the various knights from whom he borrows a trait figures Bertran de Born who is chosen for his *sen*.

5, 1-4

Domna, puois de me no·us chal
E partit m'avetz de vos
Senes totas ochaisos,
No sai on m'enqueira.

Appel (*Chrest.*⁶ and *Lieder*, Gloss.) renders *enquerre* by 'werben,' and Levy (*SW.*, *enquerre* 6) takes the same view. I prefer to take *enquerre* (with ethic dative, as *se enquerre* corresponding to French *s'enquérir* does not appear to be attested) in the sense of 'to seek,' 'to enquire,' with Diez (*Leben und Werke*², p. 153).

5, 7-10

...e, si del semblan
No trop domna a mon talan
Que valha vos qu'ai perduda,
Ja mais no vuolh aver druda.

Appel's 'was zur Erscheinung kommt,' 'Erscheinung,' 'Aussehen' (*Chrest.*⁶) for *semblan* is unsuitable here, as Bertran borrows for his fictitious lady not only physical charms but also *adreich parlar gaban* (v. 28), *acolhir* and *gen respos* (v. 53). Cp. *SW.*, *semblan* 7. 'Kind' or 'sort,' or some such word, is required, as in the following passage from Gaucelm Faidit's *planh* on Richard the Lion Heart:

Mortz es lo reys, e son passat mil an
Qu'anc tan pros hom no fo, ni no·l vis res,
Ni mais non er nulhs hom del sieu semblan,
Tan lars, tan pros, tan arditz, tals donaire.

In v. 18 (see below) *semblan*, for the same reason, should be rendered by 'quality,' 'trait' (*SW.*, VII, p. 542 b).

5, 14

De tan bela tieira.

The meaning of *tieira*, probably the same word as English 'tier,' in this passage, is very doubtful. Stimming³ translates it by 'Schmuck,' Thomas by 'tournure,' and Appel by 'Art,' which he thinks (*Beiträge*, II, p. 47) is an easy development from the original meaning ('row,'

'rank'). Perhaps *un bel talh de persona* of the *Razo* (l. 14) is intended as a paraphrase of *tieira*.

5, 17-20 Irai per tot achaptan
 De chascuna un bel semblan
 Per far domna soisseubuda,
 Tro vos mi siatz renduda.

Stimming³ renders *achaptar*, properly 'to buy,' by 'holen'; Thomas by 'demander,' 'mendier'; Appel by 'sich verschaffen' (*Chrest.*⁶ and *Lieder*), but by 'erbitten' in *B. von Born*, 13; *PD.*, following Thomas, by 'demander,' 'mendier.' These all strike one as guesses to suit the context. It looks as if the reading of AB (*agaran*) is what stood in the original. True *agaran* = *agardar* (cp. note to 17, 55) is uncertain; but *agaran* = 'to expect, await' is well attested and could pass muster. In *v.* 19 the exact value of *soisseubuda* is also not easy to determine. Diez (*op. cit.*) renders it by 'zusammengesetzt'; Stimming³ by 'entlehnt'; Levy (*SW.*, VII, p. 757 *a*) by 'erborgt,' 'unwirklich,' 'Schein-'; Thomas by 'formée de traits choisis,' 'idéale.' As there is no doubt about *soisebre* = 'to borrow,' the past part. is probably used here, like French *emprunté*, in the sense of 'unreal,' 'imaginary': 'everywhere I will go expecting (seeking?) from each lady a beautiful quality in order to make up an imaginary lady, till you yourself are given back to me.'

5, 21-30 Frescha color natural
 Pren, bels Cembelis, de vos
 E·l doutz esguart amors;
 E fatz gran sobrieira
 25 Quar re·i lais,
 Qu'anc res de be no·us sofrais.
 Midons n'Aelis deman
 Son adrech parlar gaban,
 Que·m do a midons aiuda;
 30 Puous non er fada ni muda.

For the rare use of *i* (*v.* 25) in place of the personal pronoun of the second person with a preposition, apart from the two of Stimming³ (p. 201) and the solitary one quoted by Elsner (*Personalpronomen im Altprov.*, p. 51), compare the following additional examples:

Amors, e·us prec de mon dan,
 C'autre pro no·i pose aver.

B. de Ventadorn: *Tuñ cil.*

Dompna, no puese de vos lauzar mentir,
 Que tot lo be i es qu'en puese dir,
 E mais n'i a que ieu dir no sabria.

B. de Palazol: *Aital domna.*

Donna, aquist aib son en vos,
 Et a n'i manç autres de bos.

Comtesse d'Anjou: *Donna vos m'avetz.*

Tal paor ai que ja no·i aia pro,
 Quan pens cum etz de gentil naissio.

G. de Cabestanh: *En pessamen.*

E·us am per vostre joven,
 E·us am car i es beutatz.

Cadenet: *Oimais m'auretz.*

One must not conclude from *sofraïs* (v. 26) that the lady in question was no longer of this world or that she had passed out of Bertran's ken; the past tense is prompted by the requirements of rhyme obviously, as are the perfects *frais* and *vols* of vv. 45 and 46, and also *atrais* in 8, 7. The lady mentioned in v. 27 is Hélis or Elis, wife of Bernard de Casnac, lord of Montfort (Stroński, *Légende*, p. 46), the youngest of the three daughters ('*las tres de Torena*,' 8, 18) of Raymond II, viscount of Turenne (1143-91). She was named Hélis or Elis after her mother, called Heliz or Yliz or Haeliz in the documents of the time (Stroński, *op. cit.*, p. 161, and *Romania*, xxii, p. 592). It follows that one can write indifferently *na Elis* with Stimming³ (the *Razo* has *nelis* = *n'Elis*) or *n'Aelis* with Thomas and Appel.

5, 31-33

De Chales la vescomtal
 Vuolh que·m done ad estros
 La gola e·ls mas amdos.

The 'viscountal' lady of Chales was Guiborc de Montausier, wife of Olivier, lord of Chalais. Bertran calls her *vescomtal* because her husband, though not a viscount himself, was a son and brother of the viscounts of Castillon. She is celebrated by another troubadour, Jordan Bonel, in a song (273, 1), of which the *tornada* runs as follows (Stroński, *op. cit.*, p. 80):

A Chales vai, chansos, a midons dire,
 A Na Guiborc cui beutatz saup eslire
 E pretz e jois e largues' e valors,
 Qe a leis mi clam de sos mals noiridors.

Levy (*PD.*) renders *ad estros* by 'tout à fait,' 'décidément,' but queries 'à l'instant,' corresponding to Stimming's 'sofort,' Thomas' 'immédiatement' and Appel's 'sogleich.' Prov. *gola* is best rendered by French 'gorge.'

5, 36-37

Ves Rochachoart m'eslais
 Als pels n'Anhes que·m dara·n.

Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxi, p. 605) was the first to see that the plural *daran* gives no sense and to suggest *dara·n* or *dara'n*: 'vers Rochechouard je m'élançe aux cheveux de dame Agnès qui m'en donnera (de ses cheveux).' Might not a possible alternative be to split *daran* of the MSS. into *dar an*, which would be a case of the well-known construction present of *anar* + infinitive of verb = past tense of verb in the infinitive;

and to construe *an dar* as an optative subjunctive with *que* referring to *pels*?: 'Towards Rochechouard I rush to the hair of lady Agnes, which would that she might give me!'

5, 41-50

N'Audiartz, si be·m vol mal,
Vuolh que·m do de sas faissos,
Que·lh estai gen liazos,
E quar es entieira,
45 Qu'anc no·s frais
S'amors ni·s vols en biais.
A mo Mielhs-de-be deman
Son adrech, nuou cors prezan,
De que par a la veguda,
50 La fassa bo tener nuda.

For *faissos* (v. 42) see *SW.* (III, p. 393 *a*), where it is rendered by 'Bildung,' 'Gestalt' and pointed out that the word can have that value both in the singular and plural. Cp. French 'forme' and 'formes' in that sense. In v. 43 I would place a semi-colon after *liazos* and a comma after v. 46, so as to make the first three verses refer to Audiart and the rest of the strophe to Mielhs-de-Be: 'bien que dame Audiart soit mal disposée envers moi, je veux qu'elle me donne de ses (belles) formes, car la toilette lui va bien; et parce qu'elle est parfaite, de sorte que jamais son amour ne se brisa ni ne se tourna en biais, à mon Mieux-que-Bien je demande,' etc. For *se franher* Stimming³ has 'verschwinden'; the word should be rendered literally in contrast with *entieira* ('whole,' 'perfect') of the previous verse (see *SW.*, *franher* 5). In the same way Bernart Marti (ed. Hoepffner, pp. 14 and 70) uses the past part. *frach*, *frag* ('broken,' i.e., 'imperfect') in opposition to *entier*:

5, 51-55

D'entier vers far ieu non pes
Ni ges de frag non faria;
E si fatz vers tota via,
En l'an un o des o tres;
Et on plus sion asses,
Entier ni frag no so mia.
De na Faiddid' autretal
Vuolh sas belas dens en dos,
L'acollhir e·l gen respos
Don es presentieira
55 Dintz son ais.

Stroński (*Légende*, p. 96) thinks that the lady Faiddida was probably a member of the family of Peire Faidit, an important baron whose name occurs frequently in the acts of Raymond, viscount of Turenne. As *don* depends on the previous verse *presentier* must be rendered by some such word as 'liberal,' 'lavish,' rather than by 'accueillante' (Thomas) or 'Spenderin' (Stimming³).

Song 6. Contained in MSS. ABCDFIKNRUVa¹.

It may be mentioned that for some inexplicable reason Stimming³ did not utilise (save for one piece, indirectly) MS. a¹, although a diplomatic transcription of that MS. was published two years before his last edition (1913) of the poems of Bertran de Born (G. Bertoni, *Il Canzoniere provenzale di Bernart Amoros, Complemento Campori*, Friburgo, 1911). MS. a¹ was not available when (1888) Thomas prepared his edition of Bertran de Born.

There are no means of attributing even an approximate date to this piece, unless the second *tornada* (Appel, *Lieder*, p. 17), found in F only, addressed to Rassa, is accepted as genuine, in which case the *terminus ante quem* would be 19. 8. 1186.

6, 19-22

E cel que mante faiditz,
Per onor de se mezeis,
Quan fai bos acordamens,
Asol los afiamens.

Neither Stimming³, nor Thomas whose reading is identical with that of Stimming, gives any inkling as to how he understands this difficult passage, which, as it stands in their text, is well nigh unintelligible. What is still stranger is that Stimming takes no notice of Levy's suggestion in the latter's review of Thomas' edition (*Litblatt*, xi, 1890, p. 234), which Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 48) accepts, and to which I think he ought to have adhered in v. 21. Levy proposes to read *fan* (v. 21) with ABDIK and *asol* (v. 22) with CDIKR. Read in connexion with *e que.s fezes absolver las promessios e.ls sacramens que ilh avian fachs entre lor* of the *Razo*, and with a comma after *faiditz* with Appel, Levy's proposal results in an acceptable rendering: 'and he who upholds the outlawed annuls, to his own honour, when they make a good peace, the engagements (which they have contracted with him).'

6, 29-33

Mas semblaria paors,
30 Si n'era per me cobritz
Coms ni vescoms, ducs ni reis.
Mas faitz vostres fachs tan gens
Que.us en sega dichs valens!

In v. 29 read *E* with AFRUVa¹, so as to avoid the repetition of *mas*. *Cobrir* (v. 30) can be rendered by 'prendre la défense de,' 'soutenir' (PD.), or by 'schonen' (Stimming³) or 'ménager' (Thomas). In the last two verses Bertran calls upon the powerful to act nobly in such a way that from their behaviour 'there may result good words,' i.e., that they may win praise.

6, 34-35

Us n'i a guerreiadors,
Que an de mal far lezer.

'Freiheit,' 'Gelegenheit,' 'Anlass' (Appel), 'Erlaubnis,' 'Gelegenheit' (Stimming³), or 'loisir' (Thomas), for *lezer* here, is not suitable. Levy (*SW.*, iv, p. 391 a) suggests 'Freude' and gives 'joie,' without any query, in *PD.* as one of the meanings of *lezer*.

6, 39-40

E vei los totz temps guarnitz
Coma.....

Bertran is castigating those great lords whose passion is war and who are always in the company of men who make war-engines—*tan aman lanzar e traire* (v. 38). The MSS. have *coma uiuian* (ADIKa¹), *uezian* (C), *uiuia* (F), *ueia e* (R), *uiuian* (UV) *decors* (*de tors*, F). Stimming¹ reads:

E vei los totz temps garnitz,
Coma vivian de cors.

He renders (p. 292) *de cors* by 'eilig,' 'schnell'; and adds that v. 40 is to be rendered somewhat as follows: 'wie wenn sie im Sturm dahinlebten.' According to Tobler (Stimming¹, p. 292) one ought certainly to read *Vivian* (or *Vezian*) and make *de cors* ('zu Streifzügen') depend on *guarnitz*. At the same time Tobler draws attention to the reading *de tors* of F, and suggests that this may very well hide *d'estors*, adopted by Thomas. Stimming³ accepts Tobler's proposal, save as regards *d'estors*, and in his Glossary renders *cors* by 'Streifzug' or 'raid.' On the whole I incline to the view that Stimming in his first edition was on the right track in taking *uiuian* as the imperfect ind. of *viure* rather than as a proper name. If so the translation would run: 'and at all times I see them armed, as if they lived on raids.' I cannot quote another example of *cors* in the sense of 'Streifzug' or 'raid,' but the verb *corre* with the meaning 'einen Raubzug, Streifzug unternehmen' (*SW.*, i, p. 376) is attested. Cp. also *PD.* under *corre*: 'faire une course (pour faire du butin).'

6, 71-77

Rics om que per aver traire
Sec torneiamens plevitz,
Per penre sos vasvassors,
No·lh onors ni arditz.
75 Mas els non estrenh correis,
Sol qu'ab els s'en an l'argens,
S'om puois s'en es mal dizens.

In this strophe Bertran upbraids the powerful lords who attend tournaments, not as a preparation for real war, but for the sake of the profit they make by extorting ransom money from their prisoners or by selling the horses and armour they win from them. Such a one was William the Marshal, the boon companion of the Young King, who, on his death-bed, owned to having captured in his time 500 knights at various tournaments, of whom he had retained the arms, the horses and

all the harness (cp. P. Meyer, *Guillaume le Maréchal*, vol. III, Introduction, p. xxxix, and vv. 18469–78). In v. 72 the *torneiamen plevit* are the pre-arranged, established tournaments, which took place at given times. In the next verse there is no need to render with Stimming³ *penre* by 'berauben,' which, moreover, is uncertain in that meaning; the usual meaning ('to capture,' 'make prisoner') suits the context admirably. As regards vv. 75–7, of the various explanations (for the earlier ones, to which must be added that of P. Meyer, *loc. cit.*, see *SW.*, under *correi*), the most probable is that of Andresen (*Zeit. rom. Ph.*, XVIII, p. 290), amplified by Appel (*Beiträge*, II, pp. 48–9): 'but even if one speaks ill of them afterwards, their belt does not squeeze them, provided the money goes with them.' Money was often carried in the belt and the implication is that the belts of the *ric torneiador* (v. 67) are so stuffed with coin when they leave the joust that they feel uncomfortable; but they do not care, as long as they get away with the spoil. Thomas reads *ab el* referring to *correi*; CF only show *ab el*, but perhaps *ab els* of the other MSS. is to be accounted for by the tacking on to *el* of the *s* of *sen* which follows.

6, 82. *Ses tort faire*: for the free use of *ses* + an infinitive, see O. Schultz-Gora, *Zeit. rom. Ph.*, L, 1930, pp. 296 ff.

6, 85–88

Qu'aissi fo pretz establitz
Qu'om guerreies ab torneis,
E quaresma at avens
Fezes soudadiers manens.

'For excellence was established in such a way that one should wage war by means of tournaments,' by which Bertran means to convey, in contrast with what has been said in the previous strophe, that true knights should not attend tournaments to fill their pockets, but in order to perfect themselves in the art of war. It is also their duty, Bertran adds, to show themselves liberal towards their retainers at such festivals as Lent and Christmas, instead of extorting money from them at tournaments.

6, 93–94

Papiols, s'est tan arditz,
Prèn mon chan e vai ab eis.

These verses occur in CFUV only of the eleven MSS. UV have *ses*, F has *fis* (for *sis* probably) and C *sias*. Why not adopt *sās* from C? One might also take *s'es* = *s'etz*: an instance of the common change of number.

Song 7. Contained in MSS. ADFIK.

There can be no doubt that this and the next piece (Appel's No. 8), from the precise allusions they contain, were composed in honour of

Mathilda (1156-1189), eldest daughter of Henry II of England and of Eleanor of Aquitaine. In 1168 Mathilda had married Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, who, as a punishment for the revolt led by him against the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, had been banished from Germany for a period of three years; and in the autumn of 1182 had arrived with his wife and family on a visit to his father-in-law at Argentan (Dép. Orne) in Normandy, where Henry II was then holding his court. The 'Saxon lady' (No. 8, v. 60), by whose side his lord gave Bertran a seat 'on an imperial cushion' (No. 7, vv. 27-8), the lady by whom 'the Roman Crown will be honoured if her head is inclosed therein' (No. 7, vv. 23-4), can be no other than Mathilda, the mother of the future emperor Otto. Bertran calls her *Lena* or *Lana*, not only to satisfy the conventionalities of the troubadour lyric, but also because the name of the famous Greek beauty was particularly familiar at the Angevin court since Benoît had dedicated his *Roman de Troie* to Mathilda's mother, Eleanor of Aquitaine.

Appel's No. 8, as may be inferred from the third strophe and from the *tornada*, was composed in Normandy, at Argentan itself. His No. 7, in which Bertran announces his intention of leaving for home (v. 9), was also written in that province, but belongs to a somewhat later period of the same year, as immediately after Christmas 1182 Henry II and his court left Normandy for Anjou. Thus, leaving out of consideration Nos. 1 and 6, which are in large part sirventes, those of Bertran's love songs which have come down to us seem to fall chronologically in the following order:

Ai! Lemozis, francha terra cortesa (Appel's No. 2).

Cel qui chamja bo per melhor (Appel's No. 3).

Domna, puous de me no.us chal (Appel's No. 5).

Chazutz sui de mal en pena (Appel's No. 8).

Ges de disnar no fora oi mais matis (Appel's No. 7).

No date can be assigned to 'Ieu m'escondisc' (Appel's No. 4).

Seeing that the earliest of Bertran's love songs go back approximately to the year 1181, when he was some forty years of age (he was born at the latest in 1140), it is not unreasonable to conclude with Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 17) that the greater part of his love *canzoniere* has been lost.

7, 1-8

Ges de disnar no fora oi mais matis,

Qui agues pres bon ostau,

E fos dedintz la charns e·l pas e·l vis,

E·l fuocs fos clars com de fau.

5 Lo plus rics jorns es uoi de la setmana,

E degra m'estar suau,

Qu'aitan, volgra, volgues mon pro na Lana

Com lo senher de Peïtau.

Neither Stimming³ nor Thomas attempts any explanation of this by no means easy passage. In the first verse *matís* can be interpreted either as an adverb ('early in the morning') or as the noun. In the first case the rendering of vv. 1-3 would be: 'now it would in no way be early (i.e., it would be quite time) to lunch, if one had put up at a good inn, and there were therein meat, bread and wine,' etc. This is apparently how the author of the *Razo* (*Lieder*, p. 18) understood the verses. More convincing, I think, is Appel's elucidation, recorded in *SW.*, II, pp. 251-2, and to which he adheres in *Beiträge*, II, p. 52, and in *Bertran von Born*, p. 7: 'it would not be now the morning for lunching, even if one had put up at a good inn,' etc., i.e., however attractive the inn and tempting the fare to-day is no day for eating: Bertran is so happy in the company of Princess Mathilda, to whom the song is addressed, that he gives no thought to mere comfort and to food. In harmony with this mood he continues: 'to-day is the most precious day of the week, and it ought to be sweet for me, for I would wish that lady Lana desired what is to my advantage in the same way as the lord of Poitou.' It is also possible to interpret *suau* (v. 6) as an adverb and *estar* as the impersonal verb with a dative: 'and it ought to go agreeably with me,' i.e., I ought to feel happy. In v. 4 *com de fau*, which occurs in A only, should be replaced by *e de fau* of the other MSS. In the pseudonym *Lana* (v. 7) for *Lena*, an abridgement of *Helena*, Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 52) sees an attempt on Bertran's part to reproduce the Anglo-Norman pronunciation of *Lena* (Lã'na), such as he would hear it at the Angevin court at Argentan in Normandy, where he composed the songs in honour of Mathilda. This ingenious suggestion is fortified by the fact that the MSS. FIK of the *Razo* have the form *Eleina* and that DIK read *laina* instead of *lana* in this verse.

7, 9-12

Per saludar torn entrels Lemozis
 Celas que an pretz chabau.
 Mos Bels-Senher e mos Bels-Cembelis
 Quieiran oi mais qui las lau.

The last two verses ('let Bel-Senher and my Fair-Cembeli look henceforth for someone who may sing their praises') show that *saludar* must be rendered by 'prendre congé de' (Thomas), 'Abschied nehmen' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.), and not by 'grüssen' (Stimming³). Bertran is in Normandy, but represents himself as about to start for his native Limousin. The attraction of the beautiful Princess Mathilda is so irresistible, however, that, no sooner will he have reached home, he will

be compelled to leave his country and betake himself again beyond Anjou to Normandy (*vv.* 19–20):

- Per vos serai estranhs de mon país
E·m mudarai part Anjou.
7, 15–16 Per que s'amors m'es tan quotidiana
Qu'a las autras mi fai brau.

In *Beiträge*, II, p. 52, Appel suggests for *quotidiana* 'notwendig' (i.e., as necessary as our daily bread), for which he substitutes 'unabwendbar' in *Bertran von Born*, p. 7, and 'unentbehrlich' in *Lieder* (Gloss.). Though the exact meaning of the word (omitted in Thomas' Glossary) here is by no means assured, any of these renderings is preferable to Stimming's 'geläufig,' 'vertraut.'

- 7, 21–24 E, quar es tan sobr'autras sobeirana
Vostra valors, n'er plus au:
Qu'onrada n'er la corona romana,
Si·l vostre chaps s'i enclau.

In *v.* 21, of the five MSS., DFIK have *es* and A has *etz*, while in the next verse all the MSS. read *n'es*. Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 58) emends (as above) *n'es* to *n'er*, which he thinks is indispensable. This gives, with a comma after *valors*: 'and as your worth stands so high above that of other ladies, it shall stand (still) higher on that account, for the Roman Crown will be honoured if your head is enclosed in it.' On the whole, I do not think it is necessary to depart from the MS. tradition (*es* of DFIK in *v.* 21 is merely a spelling for *etz*) in order to secure a satisfactory rendering (with a comma after *sobeirana* instead of after *valors*): 'and as you stand so high above other ladies, your worth on that account stands (still) higher, for,' etc. In both versions *au* (for the fall of the final *t*, see G. de Poitiers, ed. Jeanroy, 4, 12: *sobr' un pueg au*) must be taken as an adverb and *esser* in the same verse as an independent verb = *estar*.

- 7, 27–28 E mos senher m'ac pres de lieis assis
Sobr'un feutre emperiau.

As the cushion on which Bertran was invited to sit next to the Duchess of Saxony is described as 'imperial,' we must suppose that *mos senher* refers to the king of England rather than to his son Richard, as the author of the *Razo* states, the more so as *mos senher* is the appellation generally applied by Bertran to Henry II. Cp. note to 30, 1.

- 7, 31–32 E de solatz mi semblet Catalana
E d'acohir de Fanjou.

In Bertran's time, and till the end of the thirteenth century, the Catalans were held in high esteem for their liberality and for their fine manners, a reputation due doubtless to the welcome extended to the troubadours by Alphonso II of Aragon and his successor Pedro II. The

numerous passages in which the troubadours extol the people of Catalonia for these virtues have been collected by Stimming¹ (p. 265) and by J. Anglade (*Anuari de l'Institut d'Estudis catalans*, 1909-10, pp. 17-19). In the second verse Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxi, p. 607) thinks that Bertran is paying a compliment to the ladies of Fanjaux near Carcassonne, whom Peire Vidal praises in the song *Mos cors s'alegr' e s'esjau*. Appel on the other hand (*Beiträge*, II, p. 53) would see in *Fanjaux* a play on the words *fan* (from *faire*) and *jau*, 'joy,' and renders accordingly by 'Freudenstadt' (*Bertran von Born*, p. 8). Though such puns, especially with proper names, are common enough with the troubadours (cp. 12, 29-31), I cannot help thinking that in this case Thomas (p. 123) is nearer the mark when he writes: 'il est fâcheux pour les dames de Fanjaux que la réputation d'amabilité que leur fait Bertran de Born ait l'air d'avoir comme principal fondement le besoin de la rime.'

7, 39-40

Mais aic de joi que qui·m des Corrozana,
Quar a son grat m'en esjau.

'Greater joy had I,' says Bertran, 'in that she allowed me to rejoice in the sight of her than if Khorasan had been given me.' The mention of *Corrozana* which stands for the province of Khorasan in Persia, the greater part of which is waste land, is obviously prompted (there can be no doubt in this case) by the requirements of rhyme. Cp. Daude de Pradas, 124, 5, vv. 19-21: *Qu'ieu ai mai, s'aquesta conquer, De benans' ab un denier Que·l soudas de Corrossana*.

Song 8. Contained in the MSS. ABCDEFIKRTa¹.

8, 9. *Una gaia, lisa Lena*: there is an obvious play on the adjective *lê* (lenis), not infrequently applied as a complimentary epithet by the troubadours to the lady of their choice.

8, 13. *Tan es d'amorosa mena*: *mena* should not be rendered by 'Gestalt' (Stimming³) or by 'conduite' (Thomas). Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxii, p. 206) was the first to point out that the French equivalent is 'façon,' 'sorte,' with which Appel's 'Art' (*Lieder*, Gloss.) agrees.

8, 17-24

De tota beutat terrena
An pretz las tres de Torena
.....
20 Mas ilh n'a sobre lor mais
Tan quan fis aurs sobr' arena;
E no vuolh aver Ravena
Ni Roais
Ses cujar qu'ela·m retena.

Fis, *verais* of Stimming³ in v. 19, left blank by Appel, is not found in any of the eleven MSS. The nearest to it is *fis e uerays* of R, which gives

one syllable too many. DFIK have *don mapais* (= *don m'apais*) referring apparently to *de tota beutat terrena* and which Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 50) thinks might perhaps pass. I wonder whether by choosing the reading of AB (*fis essais*) and of a¹ (*fis e sais*) and emending to *fi·n essais*, with the not uncommon plural of the abstract noun instead of the singular, one might interpret: 'of all earthly beauty the three ladies of Turenne have the prize; I have made the trial of it,' i.e., I have put the matter to the test? In v. 24 *Que·m cuiðes que no·m retena*, according to DFIK, is more strongly supported by the MS. tradition than the reading preferred by Stimming³ and Appel (as above). For *n* instead of *ñ* (*retena*) at the rhyme cp. B. Marti, 63, 4, and Arnaut de Marueilh, 30, 10.

8, 33-36

Que la noch fai parer dia
La gola, e qui·n vezia
Plus en jös,
Totz lo mons en genzaria!

In the last verse the reading (*nalumpnaria* = *n'alumnaria*) of the other group of MSS. (DFIK) should be followed. 'The lady's bosom,' says Bertran, 'makes night appear like day, and if one saw more of her lower down, the whole world would be lit up thereby.' As Appel points out (*Beiträge*, II, p. 50), the version of DFIK is much more picturesque and reinforces by means of a telling crescendo the idea contained in v. 33. It also obviates the repetition of the verb *genzar* (not that this has much weight) already used in v. 29.

8, 53-60

Et agra·m mort ses falhia
L'enuois e la vilania
55 D'Argentos,
Ma·l gentils cors amors
E la doussa chara pia...
60 De la Saissa·m defendia.

With regard to *D'Argentos* (v. 55) it should be pointed out that the correct form is *Argenton* (*Argentomum*), as also in OF (cp. *Rou*, 3370: *Argenton arst tut e destruiust*); the *s* does not belong to the stem (cp. note to 26, 14) and was no doubt prompted by the requirements of rhyme. The place, in the southern part of Normandy on the river Orne, it may be noted, is now called Argentan. In v. 56 Thomas gives preference to the reading of C (*mas lo gens cors amors*); but the whole group DFIK favours *mas lo regarz amors*, which suits the context better and has the additional advantage of enabling us to dispense with the rather unusual *ma·l* = *mas lo*. The masculine of *pia* by the way is not *pius*, as Stimming³ has it, but *piu*.

(To be continued.)

L. E. KASTNER.

GRACIÁN'S 'AGUDEZA Y ARTE DE INGENIO'

II.

THERE is much value for us in the *Arte de ingenio*, apart from its utility as an indication of the nature of conceptist art, even as a guide to the conceit in all epochs, certainly as an enquiry into this kind of expression (incidentally, therefore, into the very soul of wit, which is not brevity, but speed); but these considerations are not likely to weigh with 'a reading public'—whom Gracián himself would have contemptuously ignored as 'vulgo.' What still is of value to all interested in questions of æsthetic, and the history of æsthetic theory, is the general ideas, explicit and implied, contained in this enormous volume. There remains one more source of interest and value in the *Agudeza*, for the modern reader. In it we have a highly trained workman in a tradition of no simple art standing at the end of one of the most brilliant, or at least, for the sake of the unsympathetic, let us call it glittering periods in any national literature. Gracián stands on the very verge of the nothingness that swallowed up all Spain in the second half of the seventeenth century, and he looks back over a period of achievement that starts up suddenly from the Middle Ages, a span of close on one hundred and fifty years. The examples quoted in the *Agudeza* number well over one thousand, of which quite five hundred are from Spanish writers of the 'golden age.' The remainder are drawn from the classics, especially the *bilbilitano* Martial, and from the Fathers of the Church (every reader of the Roman Breviary knows it for an inexhaustible mine of conceits); these five hundred modern Spanish quotations form an anthology of baroque literature that can be equalled only by the *Cancioneros* of an earlier age in quality and representativeness.

The author most quoted is, as one would expect, Góngora, quotations from whom come near to one hundred, many of them lengthy. Besides him are quoted freely the brothers Argensola, Rufo ('el Jurado de Córdoba'), Lope de Vega; each of these writers is represented to the number of thirty to forty quotations. Mendoza, Mateo Alemán, Luís de León, the preacher Andrade (many sacred orators are introduced to us in these pages, amongst them the famous Paravicino), Castiglione (author of *Il Cortegiano*), and Herrera are amply quoted; also significantly,

Boccalini, John Barclay, Marino, Guarini, Alciatus among the Italian and other foreign writers, amongst whom figure also the Portuguese Montemayor and, naturally, Camoës, of both of whom, no doubt, Gracián heard much from Pablo de Prada.

His own family are given honourable mention, and the quotations Gracián gives us from their sayings, sermons or writings afford us attractive glimpses of his and their private life. One of the quaintest and most appealing of Gracián's tastes is for Don Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor*.

The importance of most of these authors from another point of view, that of considering sources for Gracián's other works, more especially the *Criticón*, cannot be overestimated, and the tallying of his opinions as expressed here and in the *Criticón* affords an instructive example of the stability of his literary criticism.

There was no modern edition of the book till 1929, when Sr Ovejero reprinted it from the second Huesca edition in the series of *Filósofos españoles*. Unfortunately, this hardly succeeds in being a reprint, since there are so many slips and omissions.

The full version and the work usually referred to here as the *Agudeza* is the second, 1648 edition of Gracián's book. Six years before this Gracián had published a first edition of this work: 'con privilegio en Madrid, por Juan Sánchez, a costa de Roberto Lorenzo, mercader de libros.' This was published with the same main title (shorter than in succeeding editions) as that of the second edition: *Arte de ingenio, tratado de la Agudeza en que se explican todos los modos y diferencias de conceptos*, under the name of Lorenzo Gracián.

There are two copies known of this first edition; one is the copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, the other is in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid. It differs only slightly from the second edition, except for the great increase of examples in the latter. The bulk of the second edition is also increased because of the translations, some eighty in number, and mostly long, of Martial, made by the canon of Huesca Cathedral, Manuel Salinas. These had been prepared for the press, as Gracián explains, by Salinas, but seem never to have reached the dignity of publication on their own, for they were incorporated in the second edition of the *Agudeza*, and of course, as part of the text, reprinted with every new edition of it.

Most of the old examples are retained in the second edition, but frequently are altered in position, and even occasionally illustrate quite another species of conceit, one more indication that, beyond the considera-

tion of the fundamental nature of the conceit, Gracián had not evolved a very rigid scheme of classification.

There are interesting trifling changes of word or phrase which show the thought Gracián bestowed on his style. In the terminology, too, there are frequent alterations, but they do not seem to move in the direction of greater consistence, although usually the sense is made clearer in the individual instance, or at least amplified by the addition of a synonymous term—not the best procedure for securing a definite terminology. Especially noticeable is the way in which in the second edition Gracián secures greater concision and verbal compactness in a sentence, but sometimes at the loss of good *terre-à-terre* assurance in the meaning.

As to doctrine, there is no development whatever between the two editions, save that all the various types of conceit are worked out with far greater detail. The main division into two, and then another two types which is contained in the first sixteen discourses of the second edition of 1648, had existed from the beginning. In the former edition this matter had been contained in the first fifteen discourses only. There are, however, two curious corroborations of the view put forward in this study, that subsequent divisions are not really types of conceit. One is that, under the discourses concerned with *semejanza*, is included one on *Apodos*, which in the second edition are given separate treatment. The other, which might be only a slip, is that in Discourse XIV (XIV in both editions, the fourteenth discourse of 1642 becomes in the later edition XIV and XV), for: 'Este es el *cuarto* orden de conceptos,' which are the words of the second edition, the first edition reads: 'Este es el *segundo* orden...', although *primero*, *segundo* and *tercero* have been correctly given. Possibly the author himself was conscious that the third and fourth types were but repetitions in a special way of the first and second.

Discourses XVI-XLI in the earlier edition become XVII-L in the later, but this does not indicate any new matter in the second edition, as these eight new discourses are in every case extensions of older types that in the first edition were dealt with in only one discourse, and were extended into two or more in the second edition. An example is the case of the early Discurso XVII, *De los encarecimientos conceptuosos*, which becomes the four Discourses XIX, XX, XXI and XXII of the second edition.

The order of treatment in the two editions, however, is entirely different, but one way seems as good as the other. Part I ends in the case of the first edition with Discourse XLI, and the second part became, in 1648, the longer by four discourses; otherwise remaining identical, except, of course, in length and number of examples. The four extra

discourses represent two entirely new topics: that of the use of erudition, and the discourse entitled *Ideas del hablar bien*, which is a further discussion of style. No doubt the enormous quantities of examples suggested to Gracián a consideration of the literary virtues which he must have prided himself on possessing.

Turning now to a consideration of Gracián's æsthetic as a whole, we must in the first place rid ourselves of any hostility to the idea of 'metaphysical' art, and to the conceit. Despite the work of Professor Grierson, and despite the modern tendency in poetry to return to something of the conception of the 'metaphysicals,' despite too the recent revival of interest in Donne, and, to some extent, in writers like Crashaw, due perhaps to the sudden apparition and meteoric career of Francis Thompson, there is still a prejudice against the strange art of the conceptists. In Spain, and amongst *hispanisants*, we see too the impatience with which anything connected with the conceptistic aspect of Gracián is received, especially marked in Croce and Coster, where it is but the more to be deplored.

In the striking revival of interest in the moral teaching of Gracián, of which M. André Rouveyre is the brilliant spokesman, there is no mention at all of the conceptist Gracián. M. Victor Bouiller, however, in practice, treats the text of Gracián with a scrupulous care, and renders his difficult style into French, a language peculiarly recalcitrant to anything that approaches verbal or mental play, with a success that can only be the fruit of a genuine appreciation of this aspect of Gracián.

But the conceit, and the whole attitude implied by the conceit, is a thing that has to be understood, and approached sympathetically if the Spanish mind and language are to be known at all. For the conceit and the conceptist art, and, if one may call it so, the conceptist mentality, are an essential aspect of Spain—of the Spains, of course. It must not be thought from this that there is any streak of irresponsible mental gymnastic in Spanish thought. It is precisely the value of this conceptist attitude that it is earnest, or perhaps better, sincere and grave, as indeed Gracián himself is sincere and grave. It is this fact that robs carping criticism of the *Comulgatorio* of all its sting. How much of the effect of so human and unliterary a writer as Miguel de Unamuno depends on nothing other than the conceit. The famous passage *Paloma*, in *El Cristo de Velazquez*, depends wholly on the conceit of considering Christ under the form of a dove that went forth from Noah's Ark; or, if it be objected that this example is but in the usual course of religious symbolism (it ought rather to be noted that the conceit is in truth essential to all religious

symbolism), let us take the more complicated passage from the same poem, Part III, section xxvii, '*Soporte-Naturaleza*':

El leño de tu cruz está podado
de su fronda; bajo él no se columbra
tierra, cuyo verdor ha ido a fundirse
con la blancura de tu cuerpo....

The whole passage is equally rich in conceits. Not to confine ourselves to the educated and cultured, let us take any of the Peninsular or American collections of *romances* or *coplas*, and see whether the people too do not delight in the expression of their deepest feeling through the medium of the conceit:

I lost the ring you gave me
when I went to the water one day;
the vow that you made was of water,
and the water bore it away,

says one translated by Havelock Ellis in his *Sonnets and Folksongs*, and another given by Professor de Madariaga in his essay on the Spanish folk-song:

Como dos árboles somos
que la suerte nos separa
con un camino por en medio
pero se juntan las ramas;

or this one:

En el pozo más hondo
de mi corazón
sembré una pasionera
cogí una pasión;

or, again, these from Don José Antonio Restrepo's *Cancionero de Antioquia* (the Colombian *Antioquia* of course):

Salga el sol, salga la luna,
salgan todas las estrellas;
salga la vidita mía
en medio de todas ellas.
Una estrella se ha perdido
Y en el cielo no parece:
En tu pecho se ha metido,
Y en tu cara resplandece.

It is, then, characteristic of the Spaniard to express even profound emotion by the twisted metaphor, or exaggerated comparison that makes a conceit. As Gracián says, for the uncultured, the ability to *conceptear* is entirely *el esfuerzo de la mente*, but the conscious artist should be able to produce this vivid concept at will. The conceptist attitude is but an example of that definition of a philosopher as 'the man who sees connections.' The use of the conceit implies the requisites for what we call culture: in the case of the spontaneous popular manifestation, an in-

ipient, naïf culture; in the case of the deliberate artistry, it supposes the foundations of real culture. Constantly the reader of the *Agudeza* is reminded that, for Gracián, all art consists of relationships, real or imagined, perceived or invented.

For Gracián, as we saw from our quotations above, there exist objects in the external world, which are indifferent; there exist perceptions of these in the mind, which may be made beautiful by the devices of rhetoric; lastly, there exist relationships between these percepts, whether or not adorned by figures of speech in addition, and the expression of these relationships is the concept, the conceit. All relationship is apprehended as the result of the mental comparison of things: the essence of conceptistic art is to bring together objects (more accurately, percepts; or better still from the artistic standpoint, images) in juxtaposition for the purpose of making this comparison. A great deal of the efficiency of a good conceit lies in the mere fact of the juxtaposition. To bring together unexpected elements to form a plastic whole, fresh, surprising, new (elements, too, in most cases, of strong emotional appeal in themselves, such as words well fitted to their sense, or images of universal significance like heart, fire, star, blood and the rest), is plainly a powerful aid in the formation of the conceit. Gracián rarely touches on this point. He says clearly that he has no intention of dealing with matters of style, into which this aspect of the conceit would lead us, and he excludes likewise questions of no less interest, which we may wonder whether he would have appreciated, as for example, that sense of remoteness, clear-outlined distances, that we have come to associate with baroque art, and which Gracián himself was expert in achieving. This art is even now contemptuously received by most people; lectures and writings on, for example, baroque architecture rarely get away from the defects usually conceded to it, defects which exist only in judging it as something that it is not: classical architecture¹. By all means, let classical art be preferred, and given pride of place. But it is a fact that in every sphere the classical is short-lived. The decadent, the fatigued (if that is really the correct word to apply), the complicated, the over-intellectual, the baroque, supervenes. This type of art is bound to come, we might have at least the grace to acknowledge that it can be well done. Gracián himself did it supremely well, and in addition thought about it, and Gracián with his *Agudeza* stands at the end of a long line, or rather stands the last to vanish of a great pleiad of conceptist artists, Góngora the chief among

¹ At the same time one must deplore the fact that the baroque is hardly less unfortunate in its admirers.

them, and they have proved that 'intellectual art' can be 'not less than angelical' as Baltasar Gracián himself wrote.

He was throughout particularly insistent on the intellectual quality of conceptist art: 'as the eye is filled with seeing and the ear with hearing,' he said, Jesuitically misquoting scripture, 'so is the mind with the concept.' For Gracián, Understanding, the chief of the powers of the soul, was only exercising its exalted function when it was perceiving those relationships that build the conceit, or else, turning from the external world, and from truth, which in the scholastic definition is correct statement about it, inventing relationships and their like, building them in the world of fancy. But this is the work of *artificio*, and we are on the verge of the question, for Gracián always so pressing, of the will.

From this insistence on the mental side of conceptism we see that, for Gracián, in the same way that the perception of truth, and the invention of relationship in the mind, were the two highest occupations of the soul, so it was the special function of art to create these relationships of the fancy; art for Gracián is a thing of willed construction in the mind. Taste, too, has its place here, for some of these percepts relate better than others for the forming of the concept. The artist who is trying to construct an effective conceit has to exercise judgment in the producing of '*primorosa concordancia, harmoniosa correlación.*'

It is further of interest to Gracián's theory of art that there are two types of beauty: the beauty that the eye enjoys, and that which the intellect demands. The first is not his concern; the second is all relationships: art is the method of creating and expressing them. In his art, as in all art, things that are not lovely in themselves for eye or ear, become beautiful for intellect when conceived in the mind, as in the *Criticón* he quotes Aristotle to this effect. These conceptions within the mind or imagination are woven into fantastic relationships by the power of the conceit, and so enter that supreme beauty which imposes order on matter, and by the force of their swift appeal and conviction bring a satisfaction which other types of art lack.

It is important not to be repelled by Gracián's overdependence on the excessive divisioning and subdivisioning that he resorts to in the *Agudeza*; it is too easy to say 'the light that never was on land or sea' becomes in conceptist poetry too much of an artificial light, for Gracián would have jumped at the word; the light of artifice is precisely the illumination he craved for; and for him it is the light of eternity.

It is sometimes said, and Gracián certainly attempted to prove it, that all literary art is a matter of conceits. The epic narrative of great length,

the drama, the romance and all the rest, are but conceits on a larger scale and in a slower movement. But in that largeness, and especially in that slower movement, lies the essential difference. Either the conceit, apart from its essential requirement of prolongation, is precisely a short, rapid and effective assimilation of the diverse elements that compose it, or we can no longer talk accurately about these things. In so far as the epic and the romance draw together diverse elements in their narrative, and from them recreate a new vision of the proportion of the universe ('true' or not, matters not for art), they conform to the function of conceptist art, but not to its method; they are not conceits. Gracián, either in ignorance or more likely to extend the jurisdiction of his rules and theories, does not realise this. At times, even within the realm of the brief passage, he seems to admit as conceits tropes that are merely daring, strange or far-fetched, without constituting a real conceit, as genuine examples of his art. In these two directions he tries to extend the application of his definition: to include lengthy works and to include what is merely surprising, without reaching the complexity of the conceit. The conceit is in two movements; one the establishing of a point of contact between disparate objects, the second furthering their connexion, so justifying their preliminary juxtaposition. Such an art must necessarily be an art of brevity, rapidly accomplished, or the thread of its tenuous discourse will be broken. And so its fundamental principles may very well, as we might expect, provide a foundation for all the arts, but its materials, which are mental images, and its manner, which is prompt, must be all its own.

In so far as Gracián admitted examples in his *Agudeza* which did not conform to these his own definitions, he was inconsistent. In so far, too, as Gracián omitted to add to his definitions these further unmistakable marks of the conceit, brevity and rapidity, his treatise was perhaps incomplete. But he saw clearly, none clearer, what were the principles of an art of which the conceit is one manifestation, and the whole is all that period of strange attraction we term baroque. If Gracián missed the necessary insistence on brevity (for now and again, as for example in the discourse on the *Apodo*, he hints at rapidity), we cannot doubt that he was aware, if only vaguely, of its importance for his chosen craft. 'Lo bueno si breve, dos veces bueno' is true, more than of anything, of the conceit. And, too, Gracián's very lukewarmness in advancing the theory of *Agudeza compuesta* suggests that here he was uncertain of himself.

It is too often said, Croce in his pamphlet on Gracián more than implies it, that the conceit is but a form of the principle of all art, the metaphor.

The metaphor, of course, is not the principle of all art, any more than the conceit is; it is the principle, like the conceit, of an art. The essence of the metaphor is emotional appeal, the touching of one element in the comparison with the emotional qualities of the other. Moreover, it is single: it has but one stage, when the comparison is stated and the emotional transference achieved, its work is done. The conceit goes further, it has a different object. It aims at exhibiting a more recondite relationship than that which apparently prompts the first juxtaposition, and in order to effect this, it must make another, a second statement about the two terms of the comparison, in which the further and hidden relationship is revealed and expressed. In general, one may say that classical art is of metaphor; the artist of the baroque is not an artist of simple metaphor: he is an artist of hard-discovered relationship.

No doubt, and this perhaps accounts for the impatience so often shown when dealing with it, the conceit is foredoomed to failure as poetical achievement, at least in so far as it relies on itself; for the plain reason that the ordinary poetic mind does not work on a purely rational basis such as is postulated by the manufactured conceit; and it is the ordinary poetic mind that will prevail. The conceit by the modern artistic consciousness can probably only be acceptable in the exercise of wit or epigram. If the conceit appears to convince artistically and attain the rank of highest art, it may be found that what has achieved this is some extraneous quality in the conceit, that is not of its essence: the strangeness in the juxtaposition set up, or some 'poetic quality' in the terms themselves. Gracián did not suggest any of these things as being possible, for to him the essence of literary art lay in expressing any relationship, and the conceit which is devoted exclusively to this work naturally appeared the supreme example of artistic form. This is, of course, equivalent to saying that art must have a moral justification, or better, that art must have a moral motive. To us relationship is not enough, there must be additional significance, either in beauty or in symbolism, the beauty of associations, which in the last resort are not other than physiological, or the symbolism of something other than the actual relationship presented. To us also the conceit, if exalted to so high a place of honour, involves a certain degree of admixture in art of triviality, that seems to break up the surface of a work too much, fretting a great expanse of calm with detailed tomfoolery. Gracián's canons of taste here, though relevant, do not go far enough.

But it is also true that, in exalted moods of apprehension, we are able to admit all things into a just relationship of regeneration in grace,

where triviality ceases to exist, where consciousness floats on the high seas of complete understanding, seeing them one in Christ. In such a mood the mind can take any element, however humble, 'gross' even, and see it in its relationship with the whole, and, perceiving that relationship, use it as a term of comparison, of elucidation. Such moods are rare, to many they are unknown, and, in essence, to live in that exaltation is to live the mystical life. Those sermons so often quoted by Gracián, far from being suited to their worldly audience, can be understood only in the seclusion of a cloister; they may be understood by the illumined, but they cannot illumine the dark-minded. The simplest example is the Eucharist. No subject lends itself so well to conceptistic treatment, yet even believers may be offended if the canon of suitability prescribed by Gracián be not observed. For him, however, who lives in a world where the great scheme of salvation, as he understands it, alone is dominant, nothing can be an unworthy term of comparison for this great dogma, if it help the intellect to understand, or inflame the heart to appreciate the order and balance that this fact implies in the composition of his universe. But these conceptist sermons are fruitless to the mind not already dwelling on the plane of mental and spiritual exaltation; they may not arouse understanding, they can only excite derision.

NOTE: It is good if dangerous to venture comparisons between the arts. May we not bear in mind that this principle of juxtaposition is as necessary to design in architecture, painting, weaving of tapestry, and the arts of decoration, as it is to the conceptist notion of literary composition? In the case of the conceit, the juxtaposition must be first admissible, then as it were consummated by further exploitation. In all the plastic arts, the juxtaposition must equally be admissible, and if it is not, must be made so by distortion, and must result in a new expression of relationships, either perceptible in reality, or conceivable in the imagination.

E. SARMIENTO.

MANCHESTER.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON SPITTELER'S 'PROMETHEUS UND EPIMETHEUS'

SPITTELER is still a comparatively unknown poet, both in Germany¹ and in England. It is only in his native Switzerland that he has attained anything like the reputation to which his merits entitle him, and it is probable that Swiss appreciation of his genius is often patriotic rather than discriminating. In England he is probably less known than anywhere else in Europe, and it is unlikely that his best work would ever be popular here, for it is not of the type which the English genius has usually produced or the English people admired. Mythological and allegorical poetry, especially in conjunction with a deeply pessimistic philosophy of life, and in the form of epic, has always been alien to our national taste, and probably it always will be.

It is therefore not surprising, apart from the general backwardness of England in Germanic studies, that only one English scholar, Professor J. G. Robertson, should have paid any serious attention to Spitteler—or at any rate put the results of his attention down on paper; but it is regrettable that this should be so, for of all German poets of the late nineteenth century he is the most surely inspired with genius. His work is on a bigger scale than that of his contemporaries, except Nietzsche, and his thought is much deeper. Nor is it a small achievement to have written some of the best epic poetry in the German language. Professor Robertson calls him with perfect truth, 'the most forcible and original personality among the poets of the Nietzschean era,' and, in the revised version of his *History of German Literature* (as also in his essay on *The Gods of Greece in German Poetry*), pays a warm tribute to his genius.

Prometheus und Epimetheus, which Spitteler called 'ein Gleichnis,' appeared in 1881. It was the poet's first work—he was then thirty-six years old—and he modestly published it under a pseudonym. The title at once suggests a connexion with Shelley, Goethe, and especially with the author of the *Prometheus Vincitus*². But in fact there is no superficial resemblance to Aeschylus or to any other sources, classical or modern, except the name, and most German or Swiss scholars have believed or argued that Spitteler was not at all influenced by Greek literature. Carl

¹ In a paper read before the English Goethe Society, and published by them in their *Publications*, N.S. VII (1930), pp. 77 ff., Mr J. F. Muirhead, in the course of an interesting general survey of Spitteler's work, deplored and to some extent accounted for this neglect.

² It will be convenient if we assume for the purpose of this essay that Aeschylus was the author of the *Prometheus Vincitus*, though it is not certain that he was.

Meissner¹, for example, designates the work as 'eine ursprüngliche Schöpfung,' which has no predecessors and virtually no literary connexions, but must have sprung almost in its entirety from Spitteler's own mind.

Now this opinion is plausible enough: but it cannot be maintained for a moment if the work is examined with a careful, sceptical, impartial eye. It is easy to believe, widely believed, because the first thing which strikes us in reading *Prometheus* is that it seems to have none of the connexions or affinities which might naturally be expected. This fact, that the title is apparently irrelevant or misleading, may easily irritate the most sympathetic or well-disposed reader, and it does actually seem to have caused much of the misunderstanding and lack of notice from which the poet suffered for many years.

In Aeschylus, Prometheus is the saviour of humanity from a creator who wished to destroy his creation. He had been Zeus's helper against the Titans, though himself a Titan and an immortal, but he soon became the opponent of Zeus and the champion of men, whom, by his stolen gift of fire, he began to civilise. The civilisation of men means that they will begin to assert themselves against Zeus, that though they may still be religious, they will not be *blindly* religious. This is not the oldest form of the myth. In the oldest form Prometheus, like Satan in *Paradise Lost*, is simply a rebel against a god whom there is no reason to criticise. But to Aeschylus the gods are by no means infallible or above criticism. Ultimately, it is true, he reconciles morality and Zeus, but that can only be when Zeus has learned wisdom. Prometheus, the rebel, is right: Zeus is at first simply an uncontrolled, violent, unmoral, or actually immoral force, all-powerful, but not divine. Through Prometheus he learns moderation, justice, virtue, and becomes a god. But while he is still a force, he knows no justice, and therefore he must needs torture his enemy who has foiled him. He causes Prometheus to be chained to a rock in the Caucasus and to be gnawed by an eagle:

ὥς ἂν διδασθῇ τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα
στέργειν, φιλανθρώπου δὲ παύεσθαι τρόπου.

But Prometheus does not change his ways, or repent, or recant. He refuses to 'be content with Zeus's tyranny,' and therefore he is not released. But in his deepest misery he has a great consolation, for it is fated that Zeus shall beget a son of a goddess, whose name Prometheus knows but will not reveal, and this son will overthrow Zeus's tyranny. All the threats of the great god will not induce Prometheus to disclose the

¹ C. Meissner, *Spitteler*, Jena, 1912.

secret, and the prospect of far more awful punishment to come has no effect upon him. Zeus threatens to cast him into Hades, and as he remains obstinate, the play ends with the fulfilment of the threat, and Prometheus's last despairing yet defiant cry:

ὃ μητρὸς ἐμῆς σέβας, ὃ πάντων
αἰθῆρ κοινὸν φάος εἰλίσσων,
ἔσορᾷς μ' ὥς ἔκδικα πάσχω.

Then he sinks to Hades, where he is to suffer yet more terribly. His agonies there, and his release, are the theme of the lost *Prometheus Freed*. After many thousand years' torment he is brought again to the light of day. By this time he is the only one of Zeus's enemies who is still defiant. In the meantime Zeus has begotten with Themis, Prometheus's own mother, three children, Law, Right, and Peace. The tyrant has learnt to rule justly, and Prometheus can now disclose his secret, that the goddess from whom Zeus must refrain was Themis herself. But since the birth of these three children the tyranny has indeed been overthrown, though not in the way that the tyrant feared. Zeus has become the all good and all wise father of men, and Prometheus is released and reconciled with him. This is not the only tradition about Prometheus. In another we find Epimetheus, his brother, and Pandora, the woman through whom all evil was sent to men, as a punishment for Prometheus's theft of the sacred fire from Heaven. In another, Prometheus is creator as well as saviour, and in yet another Pandora is the earth, the wife of Prometheus, and the mother of men.

But these variations, interesting as they are in themselves, do not concern us now. The version of the myth which has always had the widest currency and the greatest influence is that of the *Prometheus Vincitus*, and it is no doubt a consequence of this fact that so many modern works on the theme contain no Epimetheus. The great poetic rendering of Greek literature has eclipsed the figure of Epimetheus, whom it does not know.

When we examine the *Prometheus und Epimetheus* of Spitteler, it is likely that we shall first notice, probably with much surprise, that the story, the superficial part of the work, has no resemblance to Goethe, Shelley, Aeschylus, Hesiod, or anyone else, apart from the two names; that, as Carl Meissner says, it is not 'eine Umdichtung eines vorhandenen Mythenstoffes.' But the second thing which ought to strike us is that the 'moral,' the 'Weltanschauung,' the meaning of Spitteler's work is almost exactly that of the *Prometheus Vincitus*.

The young Prometheus and his brother Epimetheus sever themselves from mankind, and retire to live in a quiet valley. Thither, after twelve

years, the Angel of God¹ comes to choose a king for the race of men, and turns first to Prometheus. To him he offers the crown over earth, if he will give up his soul in exchange for a conscience:

Ich habe Dich gemerkt seit langer Zeit und habe wohl beachtet Deines Geistes Kraft...jedoch...verworfen wirst du sein am Tage des Ruhms um deiner Seele willen, die da kennet keinen Gott und achtet kein Gesetz...und drum, so trenne Dich von ihr, und ein Gewissen geb' ich dir an ihrer Statt, das wird dich lehren 'Heit' und 'Keit'....

But Prometheus refuses, for he acknowledges his soul alone as his mistress: 'Siehe meine Herrin ist's, und ist mein Gott in Freud und Leid, und was ich immer bin, von ihr hab' ich's zu eigen.' So the Angel leaves him, and makes Epimetheus king. Thus the brothers part in anger, and Epimetheus is given charge over the people of the earth, and, more important still, over the three Children of God, the heirs to his kingdom, who sleep in a room in the royal castle, and whom he is to protect and preserve above all else.

In the meantime Prometheus sees his lovely mistress, his soul, on the mountain side, and is bidden to her eternal service, which will involve a life of loneliness and suffering, with one final hour of the highest happiness to compensate him for all he must undergo. In obedience to her command he kills the young of his lion, the symbol of power, and of his dog, the symbol of content. But the animals themselves stay with him, the dog in faithful love, the lion in faithful hate².

Epimetheus rules over men as a good and wise king, with a noble wife and a loving people: but Prometheus, tormented by internal discord, is driven by the Angel of God, on the advice of his 'böse Freundin,' Doxa³, into servitude and degradation in a foreign land, fighting against his unhappiness and his ordinary human longings, and accompanied by his lion and his dog. Here he works for an old farmer, still tormented by discontent, and here his lion falls ill and dies. Before he dies, the Angel has pity on him and his master, and offers to end his misery, but Prometheus, in spite of his longing for the pleasures of the earth, replies defiantly:

Nicht will aus deinen Händen ich ein Amt! und niemals will ich enden diesen Streit, bis dass du mir's gebüsst und stehest neben mir mit deines Mundes Dank und mit der Reue heissen Tränen! Denn sieh, ein Sprichwort hast du über uns gemacht, doch ich; *ich will es reimen!*⁴

Then the lion dies. The dog falls sick and prepares to follow him, and Prometheus tells him two stories to ease his pain, the tale of the 'dead

¹ The 'Angel of God' is not God himself, but, so to speak, his viceroy: in the same way that perhaps the Zeus of the *Prometheus Vincetus* is not the 'ultimate,' omnipotent Deity.

² The similarity of the two animals to the snake and eagle of Zarathustra is only one of a host of striking and indeed astonishing likenesses to Nietzsche's work.

I.e., the personification of public opinion, Belief, as opposed to truth or certainty. Defiance for its own sake, characteristic of all versions of *Prometheus*.

434 *Reflections on Spitteler's 'Prometheus und Epimetheus'*

valley,' which rendered everyone who entered it mad, and the tale of Sophia and Logos, the Children of God, who wandered out into the world, and discovered its beauty; but in the end their discovery turned everything into sorrow by contrast with the mysterious, guilt-burdened, and sick existence of God¹. During the story the dog has peacefully died. Prometheus buries him beside the lion: but henceforth all his nights are haunted by the ghosts of the two, and more and more with the passing of time. Then the last touch to Prometheus's misery is the arrival of his kingly brother Epimetheus, who comes with ointment for his sick body, and a mirror to show him his mistakes and his misfortunes, so that he makes Prometheus curse him in his greatness. The curse follows him, but meantime: 'seit demselben Tage wurde hart und schroff Prometheus' Antlitz.' This ends the first part.

The second part, which was not published with the first, but a year later, is in a different key. The subject of Part I has throughout been Prometheus, and the end of it is the point at which his misery reaches its height. The second part is the story of his triumph; but the triumph is delayed, and a great part of the book is occupied with matters which, though not precisely irrelevant, have not enough relevance to justify the length at which they are treated. It falls into two divisions, the myth of Pandora, and the 'Children of God.' The purpose of both is to display the incompetence of the conscience-guided Epimetheus. The first section shows how he cannot increase the happiness and well-being of his people, the second, how he cannot even keep the charge which the Angel had laid upon him. Hence springs the eventual triumph of Prometheus.

The story of Pandora is part of one version of the Greek myth², but Spitteler has made something very different out of it. In the myth Pandora was sent to men to be a plague to them; she typified woman, through whom all evil came. She was sent with a box, in which were all our ills, although powerless to afflict us unless the box were opened. But the box was opened, and the evils escaped among men, all except hope, which remained imprisoned. But here Pandora is the youngest daughter of God, a god ill and burdened with the guilt of a sick creation. She herself has created a lovely treasure, which she takes, with her father's consent, to earth: 'Sieh, von einem Menschevolke hab' ich einst vernommen, reich an Schmerzen, wert, dass man sich dess erbarme, darum hab' ich ein Geschenk mir ausgedichtet, dass vielleicht, wofern Du's mir gewährst, damit ich lindre oder tröste ihre vielen Leiden.' The journey

¹ The nature of God in Spitteler's *Prometheus*, in his *Olympischer Frühling*, and in the *Prometheus Vincitus*, is a most interesting point, to which I shall return.

² It appears, for example, in Hesiod.

of Pandora to the land of men is made the excuse for a remarkable description of the beauty of the world—of Switzerland—which is one of the essential things in the book and one of its greatest charms. It is comparable with the story, at the end of Part I, of the wandering of Sophia and Logos through the newly discovered wonderful creation. In the land of men Pandora leaves her treasure, and returns to heaven. But, though nature, and the sun itself, marvel at the beauty and wonder of the treasure, men do not understand it. Found by peasants, it is first taken to king Epimetheus, whose conscience fails him, and he does not know what to do with it. Then it is offered to priests, teachers, merchants, and others. None of them values it, save a young shepherd boy, and finally it is thrown away, stolen, and lost. The Angel of God, hearing of the wonder which has been given to mankind, now comes to seek it. Discovering that it is gone, he is enraged with his servant Epimetheus, but ultimately forgives him, without imposing any heavy punishment for his failure.

The second division of the second part is the 'Götterkinder.' The Angel of God falls sick, seemingly to death, and his enemy, Behemoth, the king of the next country, schemes to take advantage of his helplessness and get possession of the three Children of God who are guarded in Epimetheus's castle. Owing to the stupidity of the people of earth—a stupidity satirised with striking force and bitterness—and the worthlessness or falseness of Epimetheus's conscience, and his inability to understand the hearts of friends and foes, the Children of God are handed into the keeping of the enemy, and two of them are killed. The third is saved for the moment by the treachery of Behemoth's courtiers, but its safety promises to be of short duration. Now, after a long absence, Prometheus re-enters the story, and dominates it to the end. The Angel of God, sick and helpless, hears of the plight of his youngest child, Messias, and turns to Prometheus, whom he has ill-used and degraded, as the only possible saviour. Since the Angel is sick and cannot leave his bed, Doxa, 'seine stolze Freundin,' Prometheus's most implacable enemy in the past, makes a pilgrimage of repentance through the insults and persecutions of the people of the earth, to find the hermit, and to beg his help. On the way she meets Prometheus's soul, 'seine strenge Herrin,' and the soul undertakes to persuade him to perform his last task. As his final offering to her he does so, and succeeds in saving the last Child of God. The Angel of God recovers from his sickness, and comes to hold judgment on men, to mourn for his two dead sons, and to offer Prometheus his reward: 'und nun wenn es Dir nicht missfällt, so sollst Du König sein an deines Bruders Stelle, dass du ehrest den beschimpften Thron und reinigst des Men-

schen Volk mit deiner Tugend Vorbild.' But Prometheus will not accept the kingship. Though he would gladly have undertaken the office, he is old, and his days are numbered, 'und drum, weil ein böser Irrtum meinen Leib und all mein Wesen hat zerstört, und ist in mir gestorben so der Löwe als das Hündchen, bleibt's für mich zu spät, und einzig Einsamkeit begehrt mein Herz und erdwärts blicken meine Augen.' All he now desires is to see his home and his native country once again. So he departs: and the Angel's judgment on his people is again mild, though king Epimetheus has disappeared. Prometheus enjoys the hour of highest happiness promised him so long ago by his soul, and then, remembering his brother, seeks him out in his misery and degradation, finds him hiding in a swamp, and takes him home to the valley whence they came, Epimetheus receiving back his long-lost soul when he has sacrificed his conscience. On the way they meet Doxa, Prometheus's enemy:

Doxa. Wer ist die Seele, welche dieses alles hat vollbracht, und welcher also blindlings du gehorchtest allezeit, und hast ihr willentlich geopfert Deines Lebens Glück und Wohlfahrt?

Prometheus. Nach Stand und Namen hab' ich nicht gefragt...und eines Sommermittags fand ich sie am Bach, und allda hab' ich ihr geglaubt aus Gründen ihrer gar gewalt'gen Schönheit.

With this answer he leaves her, a mystery to her still.

It is hardly necessary to discuss the resemblances which this work has to *Also sprach Zarathustra*, for no commentator has passed them over, and they are indeed peculiarly evident, touching points of data, style, form, outlook on life and inspiration¹. There is no reason to suppose that the one work influenced the other. Spitteler's was the earlier by two years, but Nietzsche had never heard of it (*Prometheus* was almost unknown until about 1900) when he wrote *Zarathustra*; and Spitteler in his turn wrote a criticism of *Zarathustra* which showed that he neither saw its close affinity to his own book, nor understood Nietzsche, even superficially. But if we unhesitatingly dismiss the suggestion that Spitteler influenced Nietzsche, or Nietzsche Spitteler, we are by no means ready to deny that the two writers may have had a common origin for their inspiration. I believe that *Prometheus und Epimetheus* was, in fact, written under the influence of the *Prometheus Vincit* and perhaps of the other versions of the Prometheus story, and that Nietzsche, too, was influenced by these myths when he wrote *Also sprach Zarathustra* and expounded his final philosophy for the first time.

¹ The allegory in *Prometheus und Epimetheus* is much more elaborate than in *Zarathustra*. It is unnecessarily complicated, and reveals the immaturity of its creator's powers; whereas *Zarathustra* is artistically anything but immature.

Like Nietzsche, and like Aeschylus, Spitteler has a perfectly clear, if unconventional, view of life, and a definite, aggressive, revolutionary standard of values. But his book is often unnecessarily obscure, and many readers will always agree with the judgment of Gottfried Keller:

Was der Dichter eigentlich *will*, weiss ich nach zweimaliger Lektür noch nicht. Ich sehe ungefähr wohl, worum es sich handelt in der Allegorie, aber ich weiss nicht, ist es ein Allgemeines oder kommt es am Ende darauf hinaus, dass er sich selbst und sein eigenes Leben meint. Trotz aller Dunkelheit und Unsicherheit aber fühle ich alles mit und empfinde die tiefste Poesie darin...¹.

But really it is not difficult. The individual soul, or mind, or character, whatever it may be called, is the all-important thing about a man, and it is his sacred duty to cultivate, develop, and liberate his soul, to follow its promptings, disregarding the instructions or precepts which he may get from any other source, however reputable. In the course of doing so, he may be beset, endangered, nearly overcome by all kinds of difficulties and dangers; but if he can ward them off, keep his head up, he will win through in the end. Like Nietzsche, Spitteler hates and despises the conventional good and evil of the ordinary man. 'Der Mensch ist ein Tugendtier,' says Behemoth's clever servant, 'und ohne viel Tugend ist er nimmermehr zu fangen.' Like Nietzsche, he loathes the learning of reputed wise men, the 'Atheners' of the people of earth, their very worst counsellors. Most passionately of all he hates the quiet, easily satisfied man, 'the timorous one, who thinks about narrow utility,' the man who lives in a state of 'pathetic contentment.' Of this type Epimetheus is the example. All his virtues are of no value against this ruinous failing, which, in him, is the more accursed, since he began by realising the value and greatness of his soul, and, unlike his brother, was seduced by the temptation of worldly glory, although that glory expressly demanded that he should cast his soul away. At the end he knows this: 'Es ist geschehen am verfluchten Tag, da hab' ich weggegeben meine gottgeborne Seele um ein zubereitet Gewissen, welches richtig auf der tugendhaften Strasse geleitet hat...zur allgemeinen Niedertracht und Schande.' But Prometheus never for an instant wavers in his loyalty to his soul 'aus Gründen ihrer gar gewalt'gen Schönheit.' He admits the splendour and desirability of power, when, in his triumph, he finally refuses to accept it; but it is only splendid and desirable if it does not involve abandoning the soul. And because he is in pursuit of this ideal, he is, as in Aeschylus, the great 'Endurer,' 'Prometheus der Dulder.' His endurance can only just last out his years of misery, for at the moment when he

¹ This seems to me to be the typical judgment and reaction of the 'Biedermeier' time. See G. Weydt, 'Literarisches Biedermeier,' in the *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift*, 1932.

is called to his triumph, he is praying to his soul: 'Denn sieh, es ist zuviel, und länger wahrlich kann ich's nimmer tragen! Und wenn es dir gefällt, wohlan, so lass mich nutzlos sterben, aber jedenfalls beende diese höllenvolle Zeit des ew'gen tatenlosen Duldens.' Just so had Aeschylus's Prometheus almost broken down. But later on, he has forgotten his momentary weakness, when he says to his brother: 'Was ist uns Erd' und Himmel? Was verschlägt uns Gottes und der Menschen Urteil? Fremde sind es, die da nicht vermögen zu beglücken oder zu verdammen unsre innere Heimat!'

What is the nature of God and of the world order, as Spitteler depicts it in this work? God is not bad—he is 'good rather than evil,'—but he is certainly not admirable. He is sick, worried, and repentant, feeble and meaningless, the creator of the world, but not its master. He does not deal directly with man, but through an intermediary, the Angel of God, who indeed seems to be in much the same position with regard to his nominal lord and master as was Bismarck in the last years of William I. And even the masterful Angel of God is far from infallible: in fact, with the best intention in the world, he is a fool, indiscriminating, obstinate and narrow-minded, like Aeschylus's Zeus, with no understanding of true values or of the hearts of men: but, in a crisis, mild and forgiving. But the god himself is in the background, weak and tormented and oppressed with the guilt of having created the world as it is. For it might have been perfect beyond the wildest dreams, had not he, like Zeus (and all the Olympians) been sensual and weak. The world was born of his unholy though unpremeditated intercourse with Nature, Physis, 'das gewalt'ge üppige Weib.' 'So war's geschehen, und alles Unheil stammt daher, und also ward geboren eine Bastardwelt, gemein von Wesen aber schön von Gliedern.' But that, according to Nietzsche, was precisely how the Apollinic Greeks conceived the world: as beautiful but bad. In his *Geburt der Tragödie* he says:

Jetzt öffnet sich uns gleichsam der Olympische Zauberberg und zeigt uns seine Wurzeln. Der Grieche kannte und empfand die Schrecken und Entsetzlichkeiten des Daseins: um überhaupt leben zu können, musste er vor sie hin die glänzende Traumgeburt der Olympischen stellen. Jenes ungeheure Misstrauen gegen die titanischen Mächte der Natur, jene über allen Erkenntnissen erbarmungslos thronende Moira, jener Geier des grossen Menschenfreundes Prometheus, jenes Schreckensloos des weisen Ödipus, jener Geschlechtsfluch der Atriden, der Orest zum Muttermorde zwingt, kurz jene ganze Philosophie des Waldgottes, sammt ihren mythischen Exempeln, an der die schwermüthigen Etrurier zu Grunde gegangen sind—wurde von den Griechen durch jene künstlerische Mittelwelt der Olympier fortwährend von Neuem überwunden, jedenfalls verhüllt und dem Anblick entzogen.

Thus this god is not like the Jewish or Christian God, but a fallible creature; not a devil, but a poor sort of thing, who deserves neither love,

admiration, nor obedience. Indeed, it is only by refusing these that the world can make any headway against his stupidity. And it is a second-rate world, which might have been much better, and may yet become better, but only with great difficulty. It is not a hell, but it is by no means a heaven. Spitteler's 'Weltanschauung' is definitely gloomy, though not so gloomy as it later became in *Olympischer Frühling* and in the revised *Prometheus (Prometheus der Dulder)* of 1923. In both of these the world-order is fundamentally evil, and the god behind it is not much better than a devil. Thus speaks Prometheus's soul in the later version:

Allein am jüngsten Tage, der geschehen mag,
Am Tage des Gerichts, am Allerseelentag,
Wenn durch den Schöpfungsgraus der Schrei, 'Erlösung' lautet,
Die Pest des Daseins heilt, die kranke Welt sich häutet,
Dass Sonne, Mond und Sterne wie die Scharlachschuppen
Vom Himmel hageldicht zur Hölle schnuppen
Und rings im ungeheuren Raum, von Weltstoff rein,
Nichts übrigbleiben als der Schöpfer Gott allein—
Dann werd' ich alle Seelen, die auf Erden je
Gelitten Leibeslebensnot und Todesweh,
Um mich versammeln und in langen Reihenschnüren
Vor ihres Peinigers erbleichend' Äntlitz führen:
'Halt da!' Jetzt stehst du Rede! Flucht wird dir nicht glücken!
Und werd' am Arm ihn packen und zu Boden drücken:
'Sieh da die Opfer deiner Schöpfung! Siehe sie
Gekommen, dich zu richten. Erstens auf die Knie!'
Dann zu den Seelen ruf ich; 'Euer Urteil weist!
So grüsst doch euren Schöpfer! Dankt ihm! jubelt! preist!'
Doch siehe da die Seelen sich im Kreise wenden,
Den Weltraum mit den Augen prüfen aller Enden,
Und wenn kein Leben mehr zu schauen um und um,
Nichts als der körperlose Lustraum, tot und stumm—
Vermag ein schaurig Murren, grollend aus den Reihen,
Zu dem am Boden: 'Geh und ziehe! Wir verzeihen.'

That is a dark picture of an evil god and a cruel universe. And the vision, in *Olympischer Frühling*, of the dreadful basis of life underlying the superficial beauty, is even more gloomy; but again it is just the vision which Nietzsche attributed to the Greeks. It is worth our while to glance for a moment at the profound pessimism of this, Spitteler's best-known work.

'Des Epikers Weltanschauung,' he said, 'ist sogar düsterer als die des Tragikers. Denn der Tragiker schaut aus dem Einzelunheil in eine moralische Weltordnung empor, der Epiker dagegen schaut durch den Sonnenschein der äussern Welt in hohle finstere Tiefen.' This is exactly what Nietzsche says about the pessimism of the Greeks in *Die Geburt der Tragödie*.

Geh nicht von dannen, sondern höre erst, was die griechische Volksweisheit von diesem selben Leben aussagt, das sich hier mit so unerklärlicher Heiterkeit vor dir ausbreitet. Es geht die alte Sage, dass König Midas lange Zeit nach dem weisen Silen,

dem Begleiter des Dionysus, im Walde gejagt habe, ohne ihn zu fangen. Als er ihm endlich in die Hände gefallen ist, fragt der König, was für den Menschen das Allerbeste und Allervorzüglichste sei. Starr und unbeweglich schweigt der Dämon: bis er, durch den König gezwungen, endlich unter gellem Lachen in diese Worte ausbricht: Elendes Eintagsgeschlecht, des Zufalls Kinder und der Mühsal, was zwingst du mich dir zu sagen, was nicht zu hören für dich das Erspriesslichste ist? Das Allerbeste ist für dich gänzlich unerreichbar: nicht geboren zu sein, nicht zu sein, nichts zu sein. Das Zweitbeste aber ist für dich—bald zu sterben.

Spitteler, it seems, acquired this outlook partly through the influence of Jakob Burckhardt, who in his turn built, like Nietzsche, upon Schopenhauer. But between Spitteler and Burckhardt or Schopenhauer there is an immense difference in the effect which such an outlook has upon their mode of life. Spitteler does not become a hermit or a secluded scholar, but attacks misery, thankful for the good which is occasionally mixed in with the evil, and still more thankful for beauty. He dreams of a Metakosmos¹ and a Meon², though he recognises that it is only a dream, and nothing more. And the sorrows of our hopeless life call forth from him, at the end, a triumphant answer, the 'Dennoch' of Herakles, whereby the doomed mortal man virtually overcomes the powers which oppress him, as Prometheus overcame them.

In *Olympischer Frühling* the world-order is controlled by the terrible god or devil Ananke, Necessity. Ananke in part represents the impersonal, mechanical laws of the universe, and he is depicted presiding in his workshop over the operations of the cosmos. But he is also a *person*, an omnipotent god, at least for a period of time, though ultimately acting under a more remote compelling necessity, 'der gezwungene Zwang,' eventually to be overthrown by a saviour from the fabled land of Meon. His operations in the world are purely evil, though purely according to rule. He is, like a primitive god, the controller of rain, storm and thunder and also a savage, destructive hater of life, as most gods were in the earliest days of belief. He is 'Herr des Weltalls, mit gelben Tiger-Augen,' pictured, in a moment of anger, thus:

Seine fürchterliche Raubtiermaske schob
Er wildlings durch den Efeu, welche Ingrimmschnob.

One day Zeus accidentally saw through heaven:

Doch was er schaute, füllte seine Brust mit Grauen.
Anankes zornige Riesenfüsse sah in steten
Gemessenen Tritten er die Weltenmühle treten,

destroying stars, and slaying souls. Ananke is all powerful in the smallest and greatest things. He causes the universe to go on its way, and he causes Hera and Zeus to quarrel, that it may pursue its allotted course. With him are associated his three daughters: Moira, Fate, hard,

¹ See below, p. 441.

² See below, p. 442.

severe, masked with iron; Megara, the creator of mortal bodies out of souls, cruel and pitiless, burdening the soul with all the muddy horror of flesh and blood; and Gorgo, who represents Lust.

These are the forces ruling the universe; and the result is one of the most desperate pictures of Nature 'red in tooth and claw':

Das war die Schilderung, die ihm vor Augen stieg:
Der irdischen Geschöpfe ewiger Bruderkrieg,
Entfacht von Hungerzwang, der herrisch Speise heischt,
Alle verdammt, dass eins das andere zerfleischt,
Er sah das tausendfach gestaltete Getier
In Wasser, Land, und Luft, erfüllt mit Mordbegier
Einander gegenseitig wütend überfallen....

In this the only consolation, the only redeeming spark, is man. Man's fate is sometimes the most dreadful of all, but though many of his characteristics call forth Spitteler's most pungent satire, though he fights and kills like any beast, he has at least pity¹:

Nur eines bring' ich euch auf brüderlichen Armen
Als Gastgeschenk, das Herz, das Mitleid, das Erbarmen....

Men are all the more tragic, because they understand, know that they must suffer and make others suffer, but are perfectly helpless to alter anything. Over and over again Spitteler approaches that 'melancholy of the Greeks,' that sadness over the waste and tragedy of life, which with all their enthusiasm for beauty and their joy in life they expressed more strikingly and more often than any more gloomy race has done:

μη φῦναι τὸν ἅπαντα νικᾷ λόγον· τὸ δ', ἐπεὶ φανῇ, βῆναι κείθεν ὁθενπερ ἦκει πολὺ
δευτερον ὡς τάχιστα.

In the canto of *Olympischer Frühling* called 'Apoll der Entdecker,' Apollo and Artemis find a land 'Metakosmos,' where all is peace and beauty and love, and in this episode the poet's worship of beauty and his longing for a better unattainable world find their truest expression. The particular canto has generally been acclaimed as the most purely beautiful in the whole work, and it is the only place where the poet allows himself to believe for a moment in the possibility of perfect beauty and peace and of cosmic order:

Auf eine Höhe kamen sie, mit Namen 'Selig,'
Dem Schmerz entrückt, lustreich, an Gütern überzählig,
Bewohnt von Hesperidenvolk, von Wesen gut,
Von Anblick schön, das Böses weder kennt noch tut.
...Wenn zwei, wer immer auch, an sich vorübergehn,
So lachen sie solange sie einander sehn.
Vor Freude lachen sie, versteh, mit Aug' und Munde.
So wird das Leben inhaltreich, und froh die Stunde.

¹ Here Spitteler is in absolute antithesis to Nietzsche, for whom pity is entirely bad.

But Spitteler's real outlook on life is unrelievedly gloomy, and this combination of black pessimism with a love for the beauty and bravery which superficially cover the darkness seems particularly Greek, and in all likelihood, considering Spitteler's knowledge of Greek¹ and his enthusiasm for the literature and thought of the Greeks, intentionally so. In one place, and one only, in *Olympischer Frühling*, does any prospect of a deliverance appear. That is in the scene where Uranos leads the gods to the shore of the sea of Nirwana, and they hear from the waiting and dreaming angel 'Hoffnung,' of the land of Meon² hidden beyond the sea, whence some day a deliverer shall come. But to the question 'when?' the angel's only answer is:

Wenn ihr vom Lande Meon hört die Hähne krähen,
Wenn in Nirwanas Meer die Schnitter Schwaden mähen—

That is, never. Yet here too we hear from Uranos' lips the same advice as in the story of Prometheus:

Dies, liebe Brüder, riet er, wollet unterlassen,
Mit tatenloser Hoffnung müssig sich befassen,
Um stets gespannt und stetsfort neu enttäuscht zu sein,
Das, Freunde, ist des Herzens grauensvollste Pein.
Auch ich, ja, ich vor langer, undenkbarer Zeit,
Als ich noch frisch war, und noch jung die Ewigkeit,
Auch ich bin hier am Felsen Eschaton gesessen,
Die Fläche des nirwanischen Meeres zu ermessen,
Und jenseits nach dem Lande Meon auszuspähen,
Ob sich der Morgen röte, ob die Hähne krähen...
Und welcherlei Erfolg davon und Trost gefunden?
Zwei tränenkranke Augen, und die Hand voll Wunden.
Drum heim. Man mag die Welt auch ohne euch erlösen,
Uns aber trifft der Krieg des Guten mit dem Bösen.

But it is all quite hopeless. Behind the colour and light, joy and activity, tragedy and pathos, the fullness of life and the love of battle—very Homeric in some ways, if very modern in others—behind it all, as in Homer or as in Sophocles, is the dark, deep knowledge of the tragic, which from time to time casts its shadow across the splendour. Achilles knew that he must come to an untimely end, and go to a land where joy and sun and light are not, and the power and wisdom and goodness of Oedipus only led him to a ruin worse than death. And so Spitteler's Olympians are set free, for a little while, to do great deeds, and to taste great joy, but only in the certainty and the knowledge that their time will be short. Soon the spell will be broken, the freedom will be gone, and the day of ordinary duties and ordinary dullnesses will begin. And even those days will not go on dawning for ever, nor indeed for very long; for

¹ See below, pp. 443-4.

² *μὴ ὄν*: not being; 'Erewhon.'

the last end of everything, even of the Olympians themselves, is a return to the cold and gloomy prison-house from which they have been set free.

This is exactly the 'Weltanschauung' which Nietzsche saw dominating the minds of the Greeks; and though Nietzsche's belief on this point was violently combated when he first put it forward, it has won a wide measure of acceptance to-day. Greek literature is full of exactly this kind of thing, full of the bitter contrast between the superficial beauty of life and its hideous realities, deeply coloured with a brooding melancholy over the unhappy lot of man. From Homer to Euripides, through the works of such diverse poets as Theognis, Mimnermus, Pindar, and Sophocles, we hear over and over again the bitter cry of disillusionment, and pain, and despair, and the denunciation by the human victims of the gods who have made life a torment.

The indictment of the world-order in Greek literature is nowhere so terrible as in the *Prometheus Vincitus*; and in all the literature of rebellion, in any language, the figure of the opponent, the defiant enemy of God, the champion of man, is never so splendid as in that work. We know that the dramatist intended to reconcile Prometheus and Zeus in the sequel, but we do not possess that sequel, and we are left with the false impression that the end of the existing play is the poet's last word. Spitteler reconciles Prometheus and the world-order, in a fashion, in *Prometheus und Epimetheus*, but not in *Prometheus der Duldler*; nor does he reconcile morality and the world-order in *Olympischer Frühling*—far from it.

But not only is the view of life of *Prometheus und Epimetheus* very similar to that of the Greeks: the character of Prometheus has also something very Greek about it. I should like, however, to point out that Spitteler's education and early environment make it *a priori* probable that his view of life and his ideals of humanity should have been influenced by Greek ideas and Greek types, especially while he was still young, and had not yet come under many other influences, nor had many experiences of his own.

Spitteler began to learn Greek at the Humanistisches Gymnasium in Basel, where he was a pupil from 1857 to 1860. He¹ planned at least three other works partially based on Greek myth, an *Atlantis*, a *Hochzeit des Theseus*, and an epic *Herakles*², which last, though not a line of it was ever written, was, in his own mind, his real masterpiece. It is also interesting to know that later, at Basel, he was induced by Burckhardt to devote a considerable amount of time to the study of Homer. Of this all

¹ For this see mainly *Meine frühesten Erlebnisse*.

² Cf. the importance of Herakles in *Olympischer Frühling*, and the resemblance of Prometheus to him.

his work shows notable traces, though it appears to have been Ariosto, and not Homer, who directly inspired him to write epic poetry. But much more important is the fact that at the Basel Gymnasium there was a very special and unusual atmosphere of Hellenism. Spitteler described in the following terms the effect of this upon the painter Arnold Böcklin, to whom he claimed a closer spiritual relationship than to any writer or poet:

Aus der eigentümlichen Atmosphäre des Basler Gymnasiums...welche Art von Seelenwanderung Arnold Böcklin zu griechischer Mythologie führte, und welcherlei Kraft ihn dauernd an diese fesselte. Böcklin stand zeitlebens unter der Nachwirkung des Basler Gymnasiums, und das wohl deshalb, weil der Einfluss der humanistischen Bildung einsetzte, ehe seine Seele noch von der malerischen Phantasie gänzlich gefangen genommen war, mithin die Humanistik freies Feld fand.

Altwegg, who quotes this passage, remarks with justice that it applies equally well to Spitteler himself.

Brought up in an atmosphere of Greek studies and Greek enthusiasm, it was natural and easy for Spitteler to take the names and some of the traits of the Greek Olympians for the gods of his own epics. The reason why he did so he gives in an article entitled 'Mein Schaffen und meine Werke,' where he says that the writer of an epos must keep above reality and above the earth, 'um seinen Gestalten denjenigen idealen Glanz zu verschaffen, der sie befähigt, unauslöschlich zu leuchten,' and then—and this is more important:

um für die Bilder die richtige Distanz¹ zu gewinnen. Denn wer einen Gegenstand anschauen will, muss sich allererst von dem Gegenstand entfernen, um durch die Projektion in die Wolken frische Perspektive für das Menschliche zu erhalten. Das Tägliche, aus gewohnter Perspektive gesehen, wird nicht mehr gesehen. Aus ferner Perspektive gesehen wird das Tägliche ein junggeschaffenes Wunder....

This, then, is one reason for his choice of theme, the desire for a sufficiently distant field to paint, not a specially Hellenic inspiration. A second reason, in his own words, is:

Die Herzenslust an der Fülle des Geschehens, seien es nun Taten oder Ereignisse, die Freude am farbigen Reichtum der Welt, und zwar, wohlbemerkt, Reichtum der äusseren Erscheinungen, die Sehnsucht nach fernen Horizonten, das durstige Bedürfnis nach Höhenluft, weit über den Alltagsboden, ja über die Wirklichkeitsgrenzen und Vernunftsschranken.

All this, he rightly thought, was particularly embodied in Greek myth, and mainly in those Greek myths which concerned the Olympian gods. Greek mythology had also the advantage that it was widely known, and called up at once a vision of extraordinary beauty and activity. For this reason Spitteler thought that by merely using the names of Greek deities he would take a considerable step towards his goal of giving a brilliant picture.

¹ This is an echo, probably accidental, of Nietzsche (Pathos der Distanz, etc.).

So, then, there was plenty of Greek influence upon Spitteler in his early years, and he deliberately chose his names, his associations, and his milieu in order to suggest Hellenic qualities, though not the qualities which eighteenth-century classicism emphasised or admired. There is little reason to be surprised if his outlook and his ideal man are Greek or partly Greek, and I have tried to show that the former was. In conclusion I would point out that his hero Prometheus is Greek too, not merely in name but in character. I do not particularly mean that he has a character like the Prometheus of the Aeschylean play—he has, I think, but I do not propose to deal with this now—but that he reveals some of the essential elements of the Greek national character, actual and ideal.

First of all, Prometheus is a stoic. ‘Was ist uns Erd’ und Himmel? Was verschlägt uns Gottes und der Menschen Urteil? Fremde sind es, die da nicht vermögen zu beglücken oder zu verdammen unsre innere Heimat!’ That is pure stoicism, though it may be unconscious. The stoic ideal, so influential among thoughtful men in more than one age of the Roman Empire, was precisely this *αὐτάρκεια*, self-sufficiency, the power of leading a satisfied and calm life undisturbed by the accidents of the world, and the things which may befall one.

But I do not wish to make too much of this. The resemblance, however striking, may be accidental, for the ideal of *αὐτάρκεια* has appeared more than once in the history of human thought. But there is another similarity which seems to me to be of the highest importance. The type of character which the Greeks most admired was a type which the modern world would not in practice find very sympathetic. As Nietzsche said repeatedly, the Greek hero is a man who has his own way regardless of the consequences to others. He is full of ‘Machtwille,’ he asserts himself uncompromisingly, inconsiderately, often brutally. He is confident that his own actions, whatever they may be in the eyes of other people, however they may affect other people, are justified if they correspond to his own needs and desires. Such a consciousness of self-justification is not accounted righteousness in the modern world. But in the Greek world, and particularly in the Greek world as revealed in the drama, there seems to have been a very general conviction that if a man were strong enough to do a thing, he had a right to do it, whatever the cost to others. But he must be convinced of his own justification, or otherwise he would not be strong or consistent enough to succeed. Without ransacking Greek drama to produce evidence of this, let us briefly note one or two instances. Kreon, for example, in the *Antigone*, and again in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, is precisely the hard, self-willed, self-justified man whom Nietzsche

venerated in his last years, and whom Christian ethics abhor. He does that which to him, according to precept and tradition and his own sense, seems right. In the *Antigone* he murders for these reasons: in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* he turns the blinded Oedipus out into the world to wander a beggar and an outcast, not because Oedipus is wicked or has intentionally done any wrong, but simply because heaven's anger is upon him, and therefore it will not do to pity him or to treat him kindly. Kreon is not presented to us as a monster or even as a mildly bad man, but as just, honourable, and sane, and it is thus particularly striking that in our eyes he seems to be so self-confident and with it so harsh.

But the same is true of nearly all the tragic characters, major or minor. The indifference of Odysseus to the fate of Philoctetes is another excellent instance of Greek inhumanity: but even the most attractive and unblemished persons, such as Oedipus himself, possess this belief in themselves and this inconsiderateness to others to a very marked degree. But the most famous expression of this attitude, and the most shocking, is in the *Melian Dialogue* of Thucydides. The Melians were inoffensive and impotent islanders, loath to intervene in the great war between Athens and Sparta, even though they were originally Spartan colonists: but the Athenians, strong and insolent, typically Greek, send an expedition to enforce upon them an odious submission. Their spokesmen argue the matter against each other, and in the course of the discussion the Athenians say:

For ourselves, we shall not trouble you with specious pretences—either of how we have a right to our empire because we overthrew the Mede, or are now attacking you because of wrong that you have done us...since you know as well as we do that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.

Later, the Melians suggest that the gods may favour the just weak state defending itself against the strong oppressor, and the Spartans may also lend their aid. To this the Athenians reply:

When you speak of the favour of the gods, we may as fairly hope for that as you yourselves; neither our pretensions nor our conduct being in any way contrary to what men believe of the gods, or practise among themselves. Of the gods we believe, and of men we know, that by a necessary law of their nature they rule wherever they can. And it is not as if we were the first to make this law, or to act upon it when made: we found it existing before us, and shall leave it to exist for ever after us; all we do is to make use of it, knowing that you and everybody else, having the same power as we have, would do the same as we do....

So then it is expressly claimed that might is right, that Athens' strength justifies her in doing as she will with those who, being weaker than she, are to some extent in her way, though not necessarily her enemies: and the Athenians who put forward this argument are full of confidence that

this is the eternal and inevitable way of the world, explicitly sanctioned and patterned by the gods. The Athenian speaker is meant by Thucydides to typify what Athenians really thought about things like this, though of course the speech was never actually delivered. But by these words we know what Athens, the civilised, the artistic, the idealised, believed at this crisis of her fortunes. And from Thucydides too we know how she acted, for, as he says, Melos was besieged, and after some trouble captured: 'some treachery taking place inside, the Melians surrendered at discretion to the Athenians, who put to death all the grown men whom they took, and sold the women and children for slaves, and subsequently sent out five hundred colonists and inhabited the place themselves.' And that is all.

So Prometheus. I do not mean, of course, that he is cruel, except to himself and his friends the animals: to his rival brother, indeed, he is the embodiment of forgiving kindness, at any rate after his triumph and his brother's disgrace. But he is always convinced, in this typically Athenian way, that he is and must be right, and as a matter of fact, though I have just said that he is not cruel, he is yet extremely brutal in his defiance, and intensely arrogant. But it is in this conviction that he is strong and therefore *ipso facto* justified in whatever he does, that he is so remarkably like the characters of Greek tragedy, comedy, and history, like Themistocles, Alexander (if he can be called a Greek), Alcibiades, Pausanias, and Cleon, to say nothing more of the dramatic characters whom I have already referred to, and leaving the Olympian gods on one side. There is no conscience in Greek life or Greek thought before Socrates. The pre-Socratic philosophers know nothing of good and evil, and for the sixth-century lyric poet Theognis 'good' means simply 'beautiful, aristocratic, strong.' A man shall have his own standards, and so long as he lives up to those, all will be well, for him, if not for others.

A. H. J. KNIGHT.

CAMBRIDGE.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

EMENDATIONS OF THE 'BEOWULF' TEXT.

The following notes, in which some of the 'cruxes' of the *Beowulf* text are re-examined and new emendations suggested, are in most cases based on the belief that the best clue to a problem in any given case will in all probability be found in the poem itself, and that we should, in attempting to restore the original reading, use words and constructions for which there is good warrant in other parts of the poem.

ll. 32, 33. MS. *ƿær æt hyðe stod hringedstefna isig 7 utfus*. The MS. reading *isig* can only mean 'shining like ice' (Kemble), 'ice-cold,' or 'ice-coated,' none of which meanings is quite satisfactory, as there is no mention of severe wintry weather during the voyage of the boat bearing the body of Scyld. If an emendation is required, we would suggest *ūrig*, O.N. *úrigr*, 'wet,' which occurs in the compounds *urigfēðera*, 'wet-feathered,' i.e., 'water-splashed,' used several times in poetry of the eagle (perhaps the sea-eagle), and *uriglast*, 'leaving wet or dew-sprent tracks,' used of a wanderer, *Fates of Men*, l. 29. The word *urig* is suitable for a boat and would mean 'water-splashed,' 'spray-drenched.' The change from the original *ur-* to *is-* might easily occur, especially if the copyist did not understand *urig*.

l. 367. MS. *no ðu him wearne geteoh ðinra gegncwida glædman hroðgar*. Some editors retain *glædman* and translate 'cheerful,' others, seeing the unlikelihood of such a word in this connexion, emend to *glædmod*, which occurs in l. 1785 and gives excellent sense. But perhaps the original text had *glæd min*, cf. *wine min Beowulf*, ll. 457, 1704.

ll. 489, 490. MS. *site nu to symle 7 on sæl meoto sige hreð secgum*. The key to the problem here lies in the word *meoto*, which occurs nowhere else and is likely to be due to an error in copying. If we take *sæl* as a noun with its usual meaning 'time,' 'season,' we have to seek for an imperative in *meoto* parallel to *site*. We suggest *ne ofteoh* as the original reading, and, taking *sigehreð* as one word, translate 'sit down to the banquet and do not on this occasion withhold thy glory from the warriors,' i.e., honour us with thy illustrious presence at our banquet. This exactly suits the context and is metrically correct. For the polite *ne ofteoh* cf. *no ðu him wearne geteoh ðinra gegncwida*, l. 367, and for construction cf. l. 5.

ll. 617, 618. MS. *bæd hine bliðne æt ƿære beorƿege leodum leofne*. There is no other instance of the omission of the infinitive with *biddan*. We

suggest *bædde*, 'urged,' as in the parallel passage *bædde byre geonge*, l. 2018, where the same incident is described by Beowulf to Hygelac, viz. that where Wealhtheow is urging the young warriors to drink mead from the cup she offers them. We accordingly translate 'pressed him, nothing loath.'

l. 936. MS. *wea wiðscofen witenā gehwylcne ðara þe ne wendon*. We assume that before the word *wea* one or two words have been omitted by the scribe. Reading *nu is wea wiðscofen witenā gehwylcum* we translate 'now has misery been lifted from each of the counsellors.' *Nu* begins a fresh sentence a couple of lines later, also in l. 946, for which cf. ll. 251, 254, and ll. 2900, 2910.

ll. 1107, 1108. *að wæs geæfned 7 icge gold ahæfen of horde*. The two difficulties are *að* and *icge*. It has been pointed out by Klaeber that if *að* were the word here it would be in the plural. Further, the verbs used with *að*, *aðas* are *sellan* or *swerian*, not *æfnan*; cf. *ne me swor fela aða on unrīht*, ll. 2738, 2739. For *icge* editors have proposed to read words for which there is no authority, such as *itge*, *idge*, *æce*, etc. If we examine the adjectives, qualifying nouns, or first elements of compounds actually used in *Beowulf* or other O.E. poems with 'gold' or words meaning 'treasure,' which will fit into a half-line of the B or E types as required in the present case, and which, finally, account for the mysterious *icge*, we shall find that none of them has better claims than the noun *æðeling*, cf. ll. 1920, 1921 of the poem, *het þa up beran æþelinga gestreon, frætwe ond fætgold*. We propose, therefore, to read *að wæs geæfned æðelinga gold ahæfen of horde*, 'the pyre was completed, and the royal gold brought up from the treasure-chamber.' It is probable that the MS. which the copyist had before him was not clearly legible and that he mistook *æð-* or *að-* for *and*, and seeing *icga* or *iga* with the *a* blurred he wrote *icge*, not troubling about the sense. Those scholars who retain the MS. reading *að* suppose that treasure is exchanged by the parties to the compact. But what golden treasure is Hengest likely to have had? In favour of the view put forward above is the list of treasures other than golden ornaments which immediately follows: *æt þæm ade wæs eþgesyne swatfah syrce, swyn ealgyliden, eofer irenheard*, ll. 1110–1112.

l. 1375. MS. *oð þæt lyft drysmaþ roderas reotað*. For *drysmaþ*, which is elsewhere unrecorded, read *ðrysmaþ*, 'stifies,' 'grows oppressive.' This word occurs once in the simple form in the O.E. *Orosius*, p. 142 (E.E.T.S.), and several times elsewhere compounded with *a-*, *for-*, and *of-*.

ll. 2575–2577. MS. *hond up abræd geata dryhten gryre fahne slog incge lafe*. Here *incge* has been taken by some scholars to be the same

word as *icge* in l. 1107, for which Rieger proposed to read *incge*, without, however, throwing any light on either passage. In the present instance some editors read *Incges*, which they take to be the genitive of *Ing*, the name of a hero of the East Danes mentioned in the O.E. *Runic Poem*, l. 67. But, as Klaeber remarks, 'this is a desperate remedy for a desperate case.' In attempting the solution of this problem we must bear in mind that the word *lafe* at the end of a half-line shows that one of two metrical types is alone possible, either A or C. Holthausen's suggestion *æðelinga* has no metrical parallel in the poem. The nominative *æðeling*, however, would fit the metre and give sense, as it would be in apposition with *dryhten*. But against this must be placed the fact that the word *laf*, which occurs frequently in *Beowulf* with the meaning 'heirloom,' 'treasure,' 'sword,' is always preceded by either (a) the genitive case of the person or persons to whom it formerly belonged, e.g., *Hreðles lafe*, l. 2191, *Eanmundes laf*, l. 2611, *his mæges laf*, l. 2628, *gomelra lafe*, l. 2036, or (b) a genitive plural such as *homera*, l. 2829, or *feola*, l. 1032, or (c) the adjective *eald* or *gamol*, as in ll. 795, 1488, 1688, 2563. As no proper name except *Ing* can be suggested, and no common noun at all resembling *incge*, we must seek the clue in (c); we must, that is, search for an adjective applicable to the sword used on this occasion by *Beowulf* against the dragon, i.e., the *gomele lafe* of l. 2563. The only adjective fitting the sword and likely to be written *incge* by a careless copyist would seem to be *ōmigre*, 'rusty,' the *m* of which might easily be written *in*. This adjective would suit an old sword with the stains and patina of age upon it, which no *feormend* would dare to remove. We may compare *discas lagon 7 dyre swyrd omige þurhetone*, ll. 3048, 3049, also *helm monig eald 7 omig*, ll. 2762, 2763. Reading therefore *omigre* for *incge*, we translate 'struck the fearfully-marked creature with his rust-stained sword.'

ll. 2764-2766. MS. *sinc eaðe mæg gold on grunde gumcynnnes gehwone ofer higian*. For *oferhigian* read *oferhiwian*, a verb which occurs several times in the O.E. gospels as a translation of the Latin *transfigurare*. The simple verb *hiwian* is frequently used with the meaning 'produce a deceptive appearance.' In the *Old English Glosses*, ed. Napier, quoted by Bosworth-Toller, occurs the passage *galdra hiwung...hiwedan*, 'produced an illusion.' We therefore translate 'gold may easily transform (or overcome with delusion) each of mankind.' The reading *oferhiwian* was suggested by me in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, v, 1910, p. 288.

l. 2989. MS. *he ðam frætūrum feng*. There is no other example of the dative with *fon*, whereas it is the usual case with *onfon*, cf. *onfoh þissum fulle*, l. 1169. We read therefore *onfeng* for *feng*.

ll. 3074, 3075. MS. *næs he gold hwæte gearwor hæfde agendes est ær gesceawod*. So many emendations and interpretations of this passage are possible that in all probability unanimity among scholars with regard to it will never be reached. We may however note that *he* may refer to the fugitive slave who actually did 'plunder the floor,' the 'thief' of l. 2219, 'who bore to his lord a gold-plated cup,' ll. 2281, 2282; cf. also ll. 2404, 2405, *him to bearme cwom maðpumfæt mære þurh ðæs meldan hond*. Thus, reading *goldwæge*, we translate 'he had never before looked closely upon the golden cup, its owner's delight,' i.e., he had come upon it by accident when he entered the dragon's cave.

A close scrutiny of the text of the *Beowulf* MS. shows that not only were both scribes rather careless and apt to omit and miswrite words, but the MS. which they were copying was probably in places not clearly legible. It is worth noting that the first scribe omits the letter *r* in six cases and inserts it in three cases, a fact which can be best explained by assuming that in the MS. he was copying contractions for *r* before and after a vowel occurred which he did not always trouble to expand. The second scribe (after l. 1939) neither omits *r* nor inserts it unnecessarily, apart from l. 2577.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

NOTES ON SOME WORDS IN THE 'LINDISFARNE GOSPELS.'

The edition of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* in Skeat, *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian versions...* (4 vols., Cambridge, 1874-87), has been used, and this has been corrected by a fresh collation of the manuscript. Forms from *Rushworth 2* are not used in evidence unless it is certain that they have not been copied directly from the *Lindisfarne Gospels*¹.

Arg. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* this word is used in a sense not recorded elsewhere in O.E. Thus,

Mt. xii, 39. cneorisso yflo ȝ arg
 generatio mala et adultera

Jn. Pref. 5, 8. þæt uif in argscipe ȝ begrippene ȝ forrepene
 Mulierem in adulterio reprehensam

Lk. Pref. 8, 17. geddung gesette from wæstmō² ȝ ðæm argæ sunum
 Parabolam ponens de frugi et luxurioso filiis

Mk. viii, 38. in cneoreso ðas ðerne-leger³ ȝ arg
 in generatione ista adultera et peccatrice

¹ Lindelöf, *Die südnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, p. 3, has shown that the scribe of *Rushworth 2* had access to the *Lindisfarne* gloss.

² The scribe has construed this as a noun instead of an adjective.

³ Altered from *ðerne-legere*.

With this sense of the word compare Icel. *argur* '(samræðisgjarn), parrelysten, brunstig¹; behersket av ustyrlig og hensynsløs Vellyst².'

Draga. This word is used in a sense not recorded elsewhere in O.E. in the following passage of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

Mt. ix, 20. ȝ he^{nu}³ wif ðy⁴ blodes flouing ꝥ iorning
et ecce mulier quae sanguinis fluxum
geðolade ꝥ gedrog tuelf uinter ꝥ tuelf ger geneolecde
patiebatur duodecim annis accessit

In the *New English Dictionary* (s.v. *Draw*, v. 20) three M.E. examples of a similar sense of the word are given⁵: *Juliana*⁶, p. 49, l. 11: 7 o þe pine 7 o þe deað. þat he droh for moncun.

*Life of St Katharine*⁷, l. 1910: ah þu bipenche me anan teonen 7 tintreohen þe alre meast derue þæt eni deadlich flesch mahe drehen 7 drahen.

Cursor Mundi (Cotton MS.), l. 16987:

And al þat i moght drei to pine
to sare and to torfere
Again þe pine he for me drou
bot als a noght it were.

This sense 'suffer, endure' is found in other Germanic languages; cf. O.H.G. *tragan*, M.H.G. *tragen*, Mn.H.G. *tragen*, M.L.G. *dragen*, M.Du. *dragen*, Mn.Du. *dragen*, etc.

Lufu. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* this word is used a number of times⁸ to translate Latin *fidēs*, a sense not recorded elsewhere in O.E. With this sense of the word compare in the first place Gothic *lubains* which occurs only in the passage *iþ guþ lubainais fulljai izwis*, Romans xv, 13, translating ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς; and ultimately the large family of Germanic words meaning 'believe' (Goth. *ga-laubjan*, Mn.E. *believe*, etc.).

Pinn. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Mt. Pref. 2, 18, the word *calamo* is glossed *mið pinn ꝥ writscæx*. The word *pinn* is a Latin loan-word (< *penna*, *pinna*), whereas Mn.E.⁹ *pen* represents a later and separate borrowing from O.French *penne*.

¹ Blöndal, *Islandsk-dansk Ordbog*, s.v. *argur*, 3.

² Fritzner, *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*, s.v. *argr*, 4.

³ I.e., *heonu ꝥ henu*.

⁴ I.e., *ðy ꝥ ðiu*.

⁵ In the *New English Dictionary* it is suggested that these forms are due to confusion with O.E. *dræogan*; this suggestion, in itself highly improbable, is rendered quite impossible by the occurrence of the alliterative phrase *drehen* (< O.E. *dræogan*) 7 *drahen* (< O.E. *dragan*).

⁶ Edited by Cockayne, E.E.T.S., No. 5.

⁷ Edited by Einkenkel, E.E.T.S., No. 80.

⁸ E.g., Mt. Pref. 1, 12; Mt. Pref. 6, 9; Mt. Pref. 14, 5; Mt. Pref. 14, 10; Mk. Pref. 1, 20. In Mt. Pref. 19, 19 *fide* is glossed *lufu ꝥ leufa* and in Mt. 15, 28 *fides* is glossed *leafa ꝥ lufa*.

⁹ The earliest quotation for this word given in the *New English Dictionary* is from the *Cursor Mundi*.

Snīwa. This word is used in a sense not recorded elsewhere in O.E. in the following passage of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

Mt. v, 45.	‡ sniueð ‡ hregnað ofer soðfæsta ‡ unsoðfæste
	et pluit super iustos et iniustos

Besides meaning 'snow' the Ind.E. root **sneig*²*h-* could also mean 'descend in drops,' etc.; cf. O.Ir. *snigid*, 'tropft, regnet¹'; Mn.Ir. *snigim*, 'I drop, drip, shed²'; Gaelic *snigh*, 'to drop, fall in drops, ooze through in drops³,' etc. It is probable that this latter meaning is retained in the use of the verb *snīwa* given above.

Givizla. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Mt. Pref. 3, 1, the word *mutare* is glossed *givizla*. According to Bülbring (*Altenglisches Elementarbuch*, Par. 532) this is a form of the word *wrixlan*⁴ in which the *r* has been lost by the operation of a sound-change. But such a loss of *r* seems very problematical and it is far more reasonable to equate the verb *wixla* with O.H.G. *wihslēn*, M.H.G. *wihseln* or Icel. *vixla* (cf. also O.H.G. *wehsalōn*, Mn.H.G. *wechsēln*, etc.; and see further Pokorny and Walde, *op. cit.*, s.v. *ueik-*, *ueig-*).

ALAN S. C. ROSS.

LEEDS.

THE CONTINUITY OF ALLITERATIVE TRADITION.

I have been reading with great interest such portions of Dr Oakden's study of *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English* as are within my comprehension, particularly that part of the metrical survey in which he argues very ably in favour of the continuity of the tradition from Anglo-Saxon times on. Into the general discussion of the case I have no wish to intrude, but I should like to point out what appears to me to be the weakness of the three particular 'proofs' advanced in favour of 'the continuity of the tradition.' I will take them in reverse order.

The third is the appearance of the C-type of half-line in Middle English. But surely this is rather part of the problem than a proof of a particular explanation. It is the occurrence of recognisable types that constitutes the alliterative line. Admittedly types D and E do not occur in Middle English, but since these are dependent on peculiarities of stress in word formations that did not survive, their absence cannot fairly be advanced

¹ Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, I, p. 85.

² Dinneen, *Irish-English Dictionary*, s.v.

³ MacBain, *Etymological Gaelic Dictionary*, s.v.

⁴ For the etymology of this word see Pokorny and Walde, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, I, p. 279.

as an argument against continuity. But Middle English does permit of the C-type, and its absence would be an argument on the negative side.

The second 'proof' is the appearance of consecutive lines with the same alliterative letter. 'This was rare in O.E. verse, though nevertheless a conscious device.' What evidence is there for the second part of this assertion? It becomes more frequent towards the end of the Old English period, but even from this only one triplet is cited. On the whole it seems to occur less often than the laws of chance would lead one to expect. In Middle English 'the device was employed by all poets, but by some much more extensively than by others.' It is on the whole common, triplets are quite frequent: one poem has a sequence of ten lines on *f*, of six on *h*, and of six on a vowel; another has nine lines alliterating *ss vv kk ggg*. It is clear that, while Old English poets tended to avoid consecutive alliteration, some Middle English poets at least sought it. This is hardly a proof of continuity: it may not be an argument against it, but it is at least evidence of a different technique.

Lastly, the first 'proof' is the occurrence of what might be called alliterative *enjambement*, the repetition of the initial of the last unalliterated stressed syllable of one line as the alliterating letter of the next. In this case the statistics for Middle English poems are curiously uniform: out of twenty-two poems only two have a percentage of 3 or less, and only two of 7 or more, the rest have all approximately 4-6 per cent., while no less than six have exactly 5.5. This fact is surely significant, and the figures themselves supply the obvious solution. Since there are about twenty letters that commonly alliterate, the chance occurrence of *enjambement* as of couplets would be one in twenty, or 5 per cent. ! Can the occurrence of such a feature both in Old and Middle English be seriously considered a proof of continuity?

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

MATTHEW PRIOR'S 'ALMA.'

Warton in his life of Pope made out a list of English authors who, for having treated life and manners in an unrivalled fashion, might hold comparison with Montaigne, Rochefoucauld and Pascal. In the high company of Bacon, Hobbes, Hume, Richardson and Fielding, he included Prior, because his 'elegant and witty Alma' was judged to have shown a profound knowledge of man. I do not propose to consider the justice of this broad claim, but to show more particularly that the

relation to Montaigne at least was far closer than Warton suspected. That this has not previously been observed is perhaps due to a negligent if not a wilful misstatement of Prior's own, for the occasional reader of *Alma* has not unnaturally supposed its author to be speaking the truth in the opening sentences of *An Essay upon Opinion*, where he writes:

I have read somewhere a Pritty spanish Conceit, that as we are born our Mind comes in at our Toes, so goes upward to our Leggs to our Middle, thence to our heart and breast, Lodges at last in our head and from thence flies away; The meaning of which is that Childish sports and youthful Wrestlings, and Tryals of Strength, Amorous desires, Courageous and Manly designs, Council and Policy succeed each other in the Course of our Lives 'till the whole terminates in Death; The Consequence of it is Obvious, our Passions change with our Ages, and our Opinion with our Passions.

Why Prior should have attributed to Spain an idea which, so far as he was concerned, very plainly originated in France, it is difficult to conceive, unless in so doing he was deliberately following Montaigne's advice upon borrowing from other writers. 'A reader must drink up their moisture, not learn their precepts. He may, if he likes, forget boldly whence he hath them, so long as he knoweth how to appreciate them.' For the pretty conceit, there can be little doubt, is a mere adaptation of a passage to be found in Montaigne's chapter *De l'Yvrognerie* in the second book of the *Essays*.

Les incommoditez de la vieillesse, qui ont besoing de quelque appuy et refreschissement, pourroient m'engendrer avecques raison desir de cettte faculté; car c'est quasi le dernier plaisir que le cours des ans nous desrobbe. La chaleur naturelle, disent les bons compaignons, se prend premierement aux pieds; celle là touche l'enfance: de là elle monte à la moyenne region, où elle se plante longtemps, et y produit selon moy, les seuls vrais plaisirs de la vie corporelle; les autres voluptez dorment au prix: sur la fin, à la mode d'une vapeur qui va montant et s'exhalant, elle arrive au gosier, où elle fait sa derniere pose.

The similarity of these two quotations becomes the more impressive when we remember that the prose *Dialogues of the Dead*, as well as *Alma*, show a remarkable acquaintance with Montaigne. It will perhaps be useful to cite here the lines in which Prior next elaborates the notion of this strange progression of the soul.

My simple *System* shall suppose
That *Alma* enters at the Toes;
That then She mounts by just Degrees
Up to the Ancles, Legs and Knees:
Next, as the Sap of Life does rise,
She lends her Vigor to the Thighs:
And, all these under-Regions past,
She nestles somewhere near the Waste:
Gives Pain or Pleasure, Grief or Laughter;
As We shall know at large hereafter.
Mature if not improv'd by Time
Up to the Heart She loves to climb:

From thence, compell'd by Craft and Age,
She makes the Head Her latest Stage.

From the Feet upward to the Head;
Pithy, and short, says Dick: proceed.

(*Poems on Several Occasions*, ed. Waller, pp. 216-17.)

If, even so, the parallelism of the three extracts fails to convince, it will readily be conceded that the theory has considerable advantages over Saintsbury's suggestion that the source of *Alma* is to be found in Donne. 'I am not so sure,' he writes, 'of the *Progress of the Soul* as some writers have been—interesting as it is, and curious as is the comparison with Prior's *Alma*, which it of necessity suggests, and probably suggested' (*Donne*, I, p. xxiii, Muses Library). But Donne's poem does not treat of the movement of the soul in a single body: it considers on the other hand the 'Pithagorian doctrine...and therefore you must not grudge to find the same soul in an Emperour, in a Post-horse, and in a Mucheron.' With this metempsychosis Prior's conceit has nothing in common, and once the possibility of a similarity of idea is rejected the two pieces offer nothing but contrast. In almost every stanza of Donne's poem there is an amplitude, if not a sublimity, as much outside Prior's intention as beyond his range; the intensity of the satire is equally foreign to Prior's humorous and burlesque Pyrrhonism, and the coherence of the *Progress of the Soul* is entirely unlike the careless inconsequence of *Alma*.

Before we return to Montaigne a sequel to *Alma* demands a moment's inspection. In 1748 appeared Diderot's little-read *Les Bijoux Indiscrets*, which is supposed to have been dashed off in a week to answer the challenge of a mistress, in pleasant contrast to the desultory composition of *Alma*, written to relieve the tedium of imprisonment. The tale, in the peculiar manner of the eighteenth century, discourses with the utmost frivolity and occasional indecency on the philosophical and literary ideas which were agitating its author. In a chapter entitled *Métaphysique de Mirzoa* the Sultan's favourite undertakes to provide him with a specimen of 'métaphysique expérimentale' which he will find incontestable, and the dozen pages in which she does so are nothing but embroidery of the paradoxes of *Alma*. Scorning the Sultan's orthodox philosophy she decries those thinkers who suppose the soul to inhabit the head, 'tandis que la plupart des hommes meurent sans qu'elle ait habité ce séjour, et que sa première résidence est dans les pieds.' She goes on:

L'âme reste dans les pieds jusqu'à l'âge de deux ou trois ans; elle habite les jambes à quatre; elle gagne les genoux et les cuisses à quinze. Alors on aime la danse, les armes, les courses et les autres violents exercices du corps. C'est la passion dominante de tous les jeunes gens, et c'est la fureur de quelques-uns. Quoi! L'âme ne résiderait

pas dans les lieux où elle se manifeste presque uniquement, et où elle éprouve ses sensations les plus agréables? Mais si sa résidence varie dans l'enfance et dans la jeunesse, pourquoi ne varierait-elle pas pendant toute la vie?

When Mirzoza has clinched her argument by other examples she proceeds to her chief point. There are certain creatures in whom the soul is almost immovably fixed in a particular limb or feature, as for instance:

La femme galante, celle dont l'âme est tantôt dans le bijou, tantôt dans les yeux. La femme tendre, celle dont l'âme est habituellement dans le cœur.... La femme vertueuse, celle dont l'âme est tantôt dans la tête, tantôt dans le cœur; mais jamais ailleurs.

As she concludes this enumeration she longs for one day of supernatural power.

Ah! s'il m'était donné seulement pour vingt-quatre heures d'arranger le monde à ma fantaisie, je vous divertirais par un spectacle bien étrange: en un moment j'ôterais à chaque âme les parties de sa demeure qui lui sont superflues, et vous verriez chaque personne caractérisée par celle qui lui resterait. Ainsi les danseurs seraient réduits à deux pieds, ou à deux jambes tout au plus: les chanteurs à un gosier; la plupart des femmes à un bijou; les héros et les spadassins à une main armée; certaine savante à un crâne sans cervelle; il ne resterait à une joueuse que deux bouts de mains qui agiterait sans cesse des cartes; à un glouton, que deux mâchoires toujours en mouvement; à une coquette, que deux yeux; à un débauché, que le seul instrument de ses passions; les ignorants et les paresseux seraient réduits à rien.

The last flight of fancy, in which people are conceived as reduced to one master-faculty or sense, is tantalisingly near the very significant opening of the *Lettres sur les Sourds et Muets*, that is merely a generalisation of the foregoing passage.

Mon idée serait donc de décomposer, pour ainsi dire, un homme, et de considérer ce qu'il tient de chacun des sens qu'il possède. Je me souviens d'avoir été quelquefois occupé de cette espèce d'anatomie métaphysique.... Ce serait une société plaisante que celle de cinq personnes dont chacune n'avait qu'un sens.

(*Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Assezat et Tourneux, iv, 352.)

The correspondence between the two passages is striking, and it is therefore not unreasonable to identify the fantasy of Mirzoza with the most important of the previous considerations of the notion to which Diderot refers. In that case there is a curious link between *Alma*, which in its queer way is a philosophical treatment of the physical manifestations of the soul, and such philosophers as Condillac, for it will be recalled that he took the similar conception of a 'statue organisée' as the starting point for his *Traité des Sensations*. I do not of course press this resemblance, but it is a means of insisting upon the inherent interest of *Alma* for Diderot, who must have found its whimsical theme not only sympathetically rational and sceptical, but also peculiarly fitted for adaptation to the purposes of his own argument.

The Spanish conceit, then, was born and died in France: nor is it the

only thing in Prior of which that history could be written. No doubt if A. R. Waller had completed the commentary which he projected on the *Dialogues of the Dead*, this relation would have been made clear, for there are borrowings from Montaigne in every part of Prior's work. In one of the *Dialogues* he makes Montaigne debate with his predecessor at the Commission of Trade, and whether any similar colloquy better seizes the spirit of the essayist is open to doubt. Fontenelle, who set him against Socrates, gave the latter the advantage, whilst Vauvenargues merely asked him to explain *Vérité au delà des Pyrénées, erreur au deçà*. Prior does more than this; he seriously attempts to reproduce the very manner of Montaigne, in which he is assisted by a certain skill in parody, but more particularly by a remarkable sympathy of temper. Both men lay daily on a pillow of doubt. The prospect of human error and insufficiency so distressed them that they sought relief in 'la science de l'oubli,'

Happy Result of Human Wit!
That Alma may Her self forget,

and gave themselves willingly to small folk, 'soit pource qu'il y a plus de gloire, soit par naturelle compassion, qui peult infiniment en moy.' This is the true interpretation of that revival of the tavern in his private relaxation which Johnson's unkindness put down to Prior's low birth. There could indeed be no better example than this misprision of Johnson's of a danger that Prior constantly recognised, the ease with which the judgment is misled by custom and the accidents of time or place: the thought, so dear to Montaigne, is often elaborated in *Alma*.

What parts gay France from sober Spain?
A little rising Rocky Chain, etc.

When on the next page Prior says 'Into those commonplaces look, Which from great authors I have took,' the reader is hard to convince who will not allow that Montaigne is intended. Yet Prior himself scarcely suspected the strength of the resemblance, unless his lines

And from the Transcript of thy Prose receive
What my own short-liv'd Verse can never give,

are compelled to bear greater weight than the circumstances of their composition would suggest. They are in fact the only sentences where Prior directly hints at a debt far more extensive and serious than he confessed to owe even to that poet from whom he derived the inspiration for his title, his 'great example' Spenser.

W. P. BARRETT.

LONDON.

TWO LETTERS FROM MARY SHELLEY TO GABRIELE ROSSETTI.

Gabriele Rossetti came to England in March, 1824, and settled in London. He soon became known as an Italian scholar and teacher, and even before he had obtained the post of Professor of Italian at King's College, London, in 1831, he was often consulted on matters of Italian interest. Lord Vernon, the Dantist, had occasion to be grateful to him; W. Stewart Rose frequently had recourse to him for help in his translation of Ariosto; Thomas Keightley, the author of *The Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy* and other works, wrote to him about questions of Neapolitan folk-lore. Amongst others who looked to him for the generous help he was ready to give to Italian scholars was Mary Shelley, the widow of the poet.

The following letters are preserved without special identification amongst the Rossetti MSS. in the Biblioteca del Risorgimento at Rome. I have no knowledge of other connexion between Mary Shelley and Rossetti, although the first letter suggests some slight acquaintance. Trelawney was the friend of both and might have introduced them.

From 1832 Mary Shelley was engaged in writing the biographies of Italian and Spanish men of letters for the publication known as 'Dr Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*,' which appeared in 1835. The various 'lives' are unsigned, but, as far as the Italian are concerned, all were written by Mary Shelley except those of Dante, Ariosto, Galileo and Tasso. These last are from the pen of that versatile journalist James Montgomery.

Mrs Shelley apologises for the style and grammar of both these Italian letters, and indeed they are full of mistakes, even to the spelling of Rossetti's name. She enquires as to where she can obtain the facts for the biographies of Alfieri and Monti. She is particularly interested to hear of the connexion between Alfieri and Rossetti's father-in-law, Gaetano Polidori, whose secretary the latter was from 1785 to 1789. Whether the desired interview between Polidori and Mrs Shelley took place I am unable to say; there is no trace of information from this source in the biographies. Indeed one of the questions specifically asked (in letter No. II) remained unanswered, for in the biography Mrs Shelley had to write in regard to Alfieri and his relations with the Countess of Albany: 'The death of her husband restored her to liberty...whether they were married now, is a secret that has never been revealed....' The mention of Guiccioli in the postscript of letter II is of interest as the informant may possibly have been Byron. The question of the association

of Guiccioli and Alfieri in organising a national theatre, however, received no confirmation from Polidori, for there is no mention of it in Mrs Shelley's biography.

In so far as information from Polidori was evidently not used, the historical and literary value of the letters is slight; they are perhaps worth recording for their personal interest and for the further evidence they provide of Rossetti's good-natured accessibility to those seeking information on Italian matters.

I.

Signor Pregiat^{mo}Harrow, 3^{zo} Aprile 1835.

Vuol scusare colla solita sua bontà un incomodo che la reco intorno al mio vergheggiare? Sto in questo momento scrivendo la vita dell' illustre suo compatriota Alfieri;—e vorrei sapere se inoltre la vita scritta da se stesso, ve ne sono altre vite o altri saggi, che mi daranno notizie pregiabili intorno al medesimo vuol favorirmi, gentilissimo Signore Rosetti con delle informazioni.

E poi—dopo Alfieri, devo scrivere la vita del Monti—della quale si sa pochissimo qui—chi fra voi altri hanno composto la vita sua?—e dove troverò quelle notizie che mi faranno consapevole degli avvenimenti a lui accaduti—lettere scritte da lui, ve ne sono pubblicate?

Abito sempre questo paesaccio col mio figlio—così non vedo nè Lei, nè nessun de' miei amici che così raramente, che mi fa proprio disperare. Spero intanto che lei goda una buona salute—e quella prosperità che merita i talenti ed egregii pregi suoi.

Scusa questo Italiano barbarico—non sento il linguaggio—non le parlo mai mai ne leggo pur sempre—ma pero che vuole! C'è una certa inusitatezza nella mia mente che mi fa sempre dire cento spropositi, quando tento di esprimermi in una lingua forestiera—tanto ne possiedo, non di meno, che basta per assicurarla che mi ripeto sempre

Ammiratrice e serva sua

M. W. Shelley.

II.

Gentil^{mo} Signor Rosetti

Harrow il 20 di Aprile 1835.

La ringrazio tanto per la sua amabile risposta e le di lei premure per la interpresa di una penna pur troppo indegna di quei bellissimi nomi che danno un tal lustro alla sua patria. Intanto ho da farla un' altra domanda—ma temo di mostrarmi poca discreta, e la prego di dirmi schiettamente il suo parere—non vorrei avere l' apparenza di far spropositi impertinenti, e se la mia idea le pare impraticabile, non ne dica una parola a nessuno—

Mi dice che il suo suocero, il celebre Polidori può narrare molte circostanze interessanti intorno all' Alfieri. La vita che scrivo sarà stampata nella *Ciclopedia* del Dottore Lardner—così è corta assai, cioè può fare una settantina di pagine, non più. Però, se potessi introdurre qualche notizie non conosciute, ma degne da essere pubblicate, mi farà assaissimo piacere. Non saprei se il Polidori volesse darmi queste notizie. Per esempio vorrei sapere se veramente era così malinconico e silenziale come dice il Cavaliere Hobhouse nella sua opera 'Illustrations to the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold'—se mostrava amare gli amici suoi, e se fu riamato caldamente da loro—qualche aneddoto mi sarebbero gradevoli—e poi qualche notizie sulla Contessa di Albany. V'è l' affettazione di silenzio in quanto tocca ad essa in tutto quel che sia

scritta finora sopra l' Alfieri ma sicchè è ormai morta, questo non è più necessario. Fuorono maritati? Se no—non sene dice nulla—ma se lo furono, sarebbe bene di dichiararlo.

Sarò in Londra la Domenica prossima, e mi tratengherò costà per parecchi giorni. Ma sto in un quartiere così lontano dal suo (7 Upper Eaton St. Grosvenor Place) che sarebbe indiscreta di chiedere una visita di lei—ed assai più indiscreta di dire che se il Signor Polidori mi vorrebbe far visita forse mi dirà più facilmente che scriverà alcune cosine, come dicono i Toscani. Lascio far a lei—farà lei tutto quel che sia convenevole —e mi renderà risposta con suo comodo.

Ripetendo le grazie tante dovute alla sua bontà, Credami

Serva sua obligat^{ma}

M. W. Shelley.

Per quel che ho sentito era intrinseco il Alfieri col Guiccioli di Ravenna essendo l' ultimo giovanotto—ed ebbero insieme l' idea e l' interpresa non riuscita possibile di stabilire un Teatro nazionale in Italia. Forse ne è consapevole di questo il Signor Polidori. Ce n'è qualche opera istorica dove si troverà notizie sugli ultimi anni del real marito della Contessa di Albany—non so io—e sono nel bujo—Fu lui l' ultimo dei Stuardi, non è vero fuorchè il fratello, il Cardinale York? Ah che impegno le do per rispondermi—ne ho veramente una vergogna indicibile adesso—ma è così buono lei!—e poi la grammatica di questa lettera sarà come la Cleopatra del Alfieri.

E. R. P. VINCENT.

OXFORD.

REVIEWS

Beowulf. An Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn. By R. W. CHAMBERS. Second edition. Cambridge: University Press. 1932. xvi + 565 pp. 25s.

If Professor Chambers's *Introduction* (1921) has been most appropriately called a 'landmark' in Beowulfian research, the appearance of a second edition is sure to be hailed as an 'event' in the annals of this fascinating study. 'A whole library has been written around our poem,' Chambers said on the opening page of the first edition. But looking through the new bibliography appended in 1931, we find that it covers no less than fourteen pages, nearly half as many as the original bibliography which was devoted to the entire history of *Beowulf* studies up to 1921—certainly a remarkable record testifying to the zeal of mediaevalists in various countries and to the vitality of the problems investigated by them. Textual interpretation, as heretofore, has kept a number of specialists continually busy, individual stylistic features have been thoroughly elucidated, and the study of the Old Germanic verse has been put on a new footing by the magnificent work of Andreas Heusler. An extensive commentary, we are reliably informed, has been prepared and is soon to appear in print. In the meantime the number of complete translations has almost reached the fifty mark. Even a choral work, *The Lament for Beowulf*, for mixed chorus and orchestra, was published in 1925—a sure indication of growing popular interest. Above all, the broad topics treated in Chambers's *Introduction*, the subject matter, constituent elements, and origin of the poem have received so much scholarly attention that a critical survey and a new orientation must be deemed particularly welcome at this time. We open the book with great expectations.

The 'revision' offered in this volume consists chiefly in the addition to the original book of new chapters corresponding to the three great chapters of the first part, of a section on certain new attempts at synthesis, and of the large supplementary bibliography. There are almost one hundred and fifty pages of new matter. It is to be regretted that the author did not see his way clear to taking up *The Fight at Finnsburg* again. There appear to be no insuperable barriers to a final agreement on the main controversial points, provided we bear in mind Heusler's timely warning against reading too complicated a series of events into the transmitted verses.

In the chapter on 'the historical elements' much space is given to a refutation of Boer's obviously impossible view of the Scylding feud and to a renewed, perhaps unnecessarily elaborate, discussion of the *Geatas* problem. Chambers has no difficulty in demolishing the Jute-theory as recently advocated by Fahlbeck (1924), Weibull, and Wadstein (who operates with a hypothetical intermediate Frisian form 'Iatar'). The conjecture of a Geatic colony or state in Jutland, which of late has been

urged by Schütte and especially by Kemp Malone, is not discussed. A brief hint of similar import was, indeed, casually thrown out in the first edition (p. 334), but only as a remote possibility.

It may be mentioned that the final defeat of the Geats involving the loss of their independent kingdom has been plausibly assigned to the third quarter of the sixth century (Nerman, *Det svenska rikets uppkomst*, p. 136).

Next, the archaeological discoveries relating to the Uppsala and Vendel grave-mounds are given well deserved attention. By a happy, almost exact agreement between the purely archaeological datings and the historical dates previously arrived at for the Swedish kings, it has been proved beyond reasonable doubt that actually the Swedish kings Aðils (Eadgils), Egill (Ongenpeow), and Aun were laid in mound in Old Uppsala about 575, 510 (according to Nerman, 514 or 515), and 500 A.D. respectively, and that the Ottarshögen at Vendel, Uppland, rightly bears its ancient name as containing the ashes of Óttarr (Ohthere) buried there about 525-530 A.D. This latter fact, of course, clinches the arguments against the identification of the *Geatas* and Jutes. The Swedish archaeologists, in particular Stjerna, Lindqvist, and Nerman, have certainly earned the sincere gratitude of all *Beowulf* scholars. An extensive extract (in an English translation) quoted from Nerman's paper on *Ottar Vendelkråka* (1917) will be found especially useful, since most of us, it is to be feared, will never have access to the original Swedish pamphlet.

In his discussion of Danish affairs the author outlines Wessén's brilliantly daring interpretation of the names 'Danes,' 'Bards,' 'Heruli' (involving a remarkable theory of a name-shift) and demonstrates its intrinsic improbability. At the same time, he takes occasion in this section to pay an eloquent tribute to the sound method and fine work of Axel Olrik to which all *Beowulfian* students remain deeply indebted. There is an almost personal note in these declarations, and I can well imagine that Chambers, who is anything but a narrow specialist, felt particularly attracted by the inspiring personality of that keen, far-sighted Danish scholar.

Of the numerous well-known studies of Kemp Malone the author justly says that they 'show the combination of an independent mind with a determination to benefit by what Olrik has to teach us.' He singles out for an analysis and favourable comment the ingenious paper on Hreðric which perhaps shows the bold investigator at his very best. Malone's other contributions are not examined in detail. Presumably Chambers realised that this would have necessitated an uncommonly large amount of argumentation and, again, a mere statement of results would not have been at all satisfactory.

On the question of the historicity of *Beowulf*, Chambers remains somewhat non-committal. Who first seriously questioned a historical basis for the hero, it would be hard to say. A suggestion to that effect was made in the study of the Christian elements (*Anglia*, xxxvi, p. 190). But Heusler had already expressed the same opinion, even more than once. And it may have been expressed before. In fact, this seems after all the most

natural view. The remarkable unhistorical name *Biwulf* (= 'bear'), by the way, has a striking counterpart in the name *Sinfjötli* (= 'wolf') as explained by Rudolf Much (*Zeitschrift f. deut. Altertum*, LXVI, pp. 15-24).

As regards the date of Hygelac's death, the all-important starting point of our historical computations, Chambers reinforces his arguments for a dating later than 516. His careful exposition makes it indeed appear probable that Hygelac's raid occurred 'after 516 and probably after 520, although perhaps before 522 and certainly before 531.' If Gregory's chronology were more definite and more reliable, and we had fuller information about Theodebert's (apparently rather unconventional) private life, we could speak with more confidence about this involved subject. It is perhaps of some interest to remember that a later West Frankish king, the hero of the Old High German *Ludwigslied*, was not more than eighteen years old, and may have been only sixteen, when he repulsed a dangerous Viking raid at Saucourt (881 A.D.).

There is a certain point touching the matter of the historical elements that should be strongly emphasised. It has been argued that the well-known 'reciprocal trade [of the Germanic nations] in subjects for epic poems' accounts for the ubiquitous Scandinavian elements in the Old English poem. But it is not their mere presence (as is also insisted upon by Schücking), but their curiously historical character that has to be explained. Is it not truly remarkable that we can trace the fortunes of the Danish, Swedish, and Geatic royal houses for three generations and all the time can feel sure that we are on fairly safe historical ground? *Beowulf* has rightly been recognised as a first-rate source of ancient Scandinavian history. On the other hand, how much history could be learned from the heroic poems of the *Edda*, from *Deor*, *Waldere-Waltharius*, from the *Chanson de Roland*, or the *Nibelungenlied*? That the historical quality characteristic of the *Beowulf* narrative should be due to the element of geographical and chronological proximity alone may well be doubted. Here, then, there remains a significant problem still calling for an acceptable answer.

The next chapter, the one devoted to the non-historical elements, is easily the most important part of the new book, a positive, solid addition to our stock of Beowulfian lore. Here Professor Chambers was able to make good use of his own argumentative paper published in *English Studies*, xi, pp. 81-100. Starting from Lawrence's investigations relating to the *Grettis saga* parallel and to a notable episode in the *Samsons saga*, the importance of which had first been demonstrated by the American scholar, Chambers shows that the two Scandinavian stories and the corresponding account in *Beowulf* represent three independent versions of the same original tale. A characteristic element of them, the 'waterfall-cave' scenery, is likewise found in the *Gull-póris saga* and the story of 'Gullbra and Skeggi' (which have also been referred to by Dehmer). That even in modern Icelandic tradition similar stories are known has been pointed out by Knut Liestøl. There can be little doubt that the fight with supernatural beings living in a cave beneath a waterfall is to be viewed as indigenous to Scandinavia.

The remarkable thesis recently upheld by several scholars, that the Sandhaugar episode is simply derived from *Beowulf*, comes in for a good deal of vigorous comment. In view of the fundamental importance of the question Chambers goes carefully over the debated ground, looks into every phase of the narrative, and completely succeeds in vindicating the position supported by him. Incidentally he manages to throw fresh light on certain incongruities of the Beowulfian version. His skilful handling of the *hæftmece-heptisax* matter should be mentioned as one of the best things of the discussion. Let us hope that this irritating ghost of confusion has now been definitely laid. I wish it were possible in a short paragraph to do justice to the author's incisive reasoning and lucid presentation which should be closely studied by prospective investigators of cognate problems.

Next, by a comparison of the five analogous versions, Chambers proceeds to reconstruct what may be regarded as the outlines of the original story. This is certainly far more definite than the famous 'Bear's Son' type which, of course, presents some general points of resemblance. In reality, neither the 'Bear's Son' nor the 'Hand and the Child' tale can be held to be the prototype of the story found in our epic. Both were mentioned by Laistner, as early as 1889, on account of their likeness to *Beowulf*. The latter has recently been made much of by Dehmer, who would recognise in it a specific Irish form of narrative. However, the tearing off of Grendel's arm has been unduly magnified in his (otherwise quite helpful) study. In spite of certain likenesses in detail, the Beowulfian adventures are of an essentially different order, as was perceived by Kittredge many years ago.

In the following brief chapter on 'theories as to the origin and date of the poem' the author reiterates his disbelief in Schücking's heterodox view on the dating question and voices his approval of Cook's essay on the 'possible begetter of *Beowulf*' (Aldfrīð of Northumbria), at least in so far as it sets before us a pleasing picture of the conditions under which we might imagine the poem to have been composed.

To these three chapters there is prefixed an introductory chapter on 'new attempts at synthesis' (i.e., by Lawrence and the present reviewer), which, in a way, may be taken as a substitute for a comprehensive, constructive essay on the genesis of *Beowulf*. Special attention is called by the author to the encouraging fact that there has come about a pretty general agreement on the principal problems. Even Schücking's contention for a late date, far-reaching as it seems, is of less significance for *Beowulf* itself than for the history of Old English poetry; his fine estimate of the character of our epic can be cheerfully approved by those who do not share his chronological views.

It would have been of interest to learn Chambers's present views on various matters not discussed in the new edition, such as the influence of the *Aeneid*, the puzzling Irish question, possible allusions to contemporary English history, the relation between Beow and Biuwulf, and the like. But perhaps even his silence is to be considered instructive.

A dry review can convey no idea of the pleasure the reading of this

book affords. A reviewer of the first edition very felicitously praised the 'lightness of touch not commonly found combined with all the *Gründlichkeit* of the German and Scandinavian.' There is nothing pedantic about the book, no dogmatising of any kind. The author is eminently fair, even generously appreciative of the work of others, and—it should be added—endowed with a wholesome sense of humour. There are delicious bits of refreshing phraseology scattered through the pages of this ponderous volume. No reader, I imagine, could ever forget the classical statement that 'the Teutonic chief often had a larger mind than the modern student.' Altogether, the study of the recondite mediaeval subject has been thoroughly humanised by the learned author of the *Introduction*.

The closing pages of the volume are given over to the new bibliography, a marvellous array of titles such as could be assembled, it seems, only by a man living within easy reach of the great British Museum. A pleasing addition is the supplementary list of some early references to the poem and translations of certain portions. That Walter Scott was somehow interested in the subject is further evidenced by his telling (in the first chapter of *Ivanhoe*) of a curious inscription on the swineherd's brass ring: 'Gurth, the son of Beowulph, the born thrall of Cedric of Rotherwood.'

FR. KLAEBER.

BERLIN-ZEHELENDORF.

A Comparative Study of the Beowulf and the Aeneid. By TOM BURNS HABER. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. x + 145 pp. 18s.

Mr Haber offers an elaborate comparison of *Beowulf* and the *Aeneid* gathering together parallels previously indicated and adding new ones. His thesis is briefly that the author of *Beowulf* has borrowed 'various plot motifs, stylistic devices, and turns of expression,' that 'the *Beowulf* is in many details out of harmony with the literature of which it is chronologically a part,' and 'leaves the impression of departing significantly from the traditions of the people among whom it arose,' all this being due to conscious imitation of the Latin epic. This is a large claim and to establish it would make no small demands on a very profound scholarship in the fields of classical and Germanic philology. Mr Haber is no expert in the latter at all events, and his method is simpler; he goes through the poems side by side collecting resemblances, striking and otherwise, and explaining them all without more ado as imitations on the side of the English poet. The feeling provoked is that the author is proving too much, for if all the points advanced are evidence of imitation, including special turns of phrase and specific senses in words, then the poet of *Beowulf* must either have had a private manuscript of Virgil at his elbow for continual consultation, or he must have known his *Aeneid* by heart like the best scholar among them all. A scholar such as he, one who knew Virgil half so intimately as the theory demands, must perforce have been an ecclesiastic. There is nothing impossible or

even unlikely in a churchman interesting himself in the old poetry, but is it then conceivable that in a poem even superficially Christian—and *Beowulf* postulates a Christian society—there should not occur a reference even to one single practice, rite, or belief of the Christian faith, that there should not occur in the poem even the name of Christ? For a man engaged in the service of the Church from his youth such reference would have been as inevitable as unconscious if the Christian atmosphere were admitted at all, for it was part of his normal attitude to the world around him; yet this is the impossibility that we must accept if we are to believe in this learned imitator of Virgil. Another point of some moment in this connexion is the subject of the English poem—the hero's conflict in turn against two destroying demons, and finally against a destroying dragon. Why so great a poet should have chosen just such a subject, when so many greater lay to his hand, is a problem which ever anew excites our questioning, for the subject is the weakest thing in the poem, and the author could and must have learned a better way from Virgil. Mr Haber's elaborate collection of parallels is not successful in dissipating an innate and perhaps invincible scepticism about any direct connexion between *Beowulf* and the *Aeneid*.

The main part of Mr Haber's study is contained in chapters III–VI. After a few remarks in chapter I on the opinion of other scholars, he gives in chapter II a sketch of the popularity of Virgil in England in the later seventh and the eighth centuries. Of the widespread knowledge of Virgil and his great influence on English scholarship of that period there is no question, and, as is justly remarked, at that time if at any time we are entitled to look for influence on vernacular poetry. Such an influence Mr Haber attempts to show for *Beowulf* in four separate spheres corresponding to the four chapters which follow. These are non-Germanic influence traceable in *Beowulf*, broad similarities, parallels in phraseology, and parallels in motive and sentiment. A large number of points in each case is collected, and they are set side by side. Of the last three it must be said in general that in many instances there is no parallelism at all, in others that the parallelism is accidental, and in the residue, the group which is of real interest, there is no real evidence of connexion; they can quite well arise in each case independently from the conditions, and have on that account their own interest and value. Expressions like victory or death, flashing swords, tarred ships, familiar headlands, death-sleep, are natural anywhere and everywhere where men travel and fight and die. It is permissible to make the hero stand out conspicuous among men, to say of a man that he is the only hope left, or to make him recall his home in death without suspicion of borrowing, unless when circumstances or turn of phrase compel acknowledgment of the source. The more plausible instances of parallelism are in any case not new and may be passed by, but it should be added touching those of phraseology that it is particularly regrettable that there is no systematic account of O.E. syntax, the consultation of which would have preserved the author from dubious and erroneous statements.

On the other hand something must be said on the alleged non-Germanic

traits because these are points emphasised by the author and unduly stressed by others before him. They have reference to the social conditions and social structure postulated by the poem. It is unfortunate that *Beowulf* is not merely the only epic, but (apart from fragments) the only remaining example of early heroic poetry. There is nothing on any considerable scale with which it can be compared. Yet on analysis it is apparent that all such things are visualised in the light of Germanic and Anglo-Saxon practice—kingship, the relation of lord and retainer, generosity and reward for special service, *bēot*, feud, and wergild, the outcast character of Grendel, i.e., his exclusion from the social structure which has its centre in the king's hall. The conditions which govern the poet's conception are Germanic, but by no means primitive Germanic. His conception is determined, as all such heroic poetry must be, by the circumstances of his own day. The history may be of the migration period, but the incidentals, the emotional and intellectual attitude, in a word the frame of the picture, all this necessarily emerges directly from the conditions prevalent in seventh-century Anglo-Saxon England. The luxury and the etiquette, the formalism in behaviour, reflect the habits of the Northumbrian court at the period of its greatness. If we would understand the ideal king presented we must think not of Hroth Kraki but rather of one like Oswine (Bede, III, 14). The horse-racing in ll. 864 ff. might be taken directly from Bede, v, 6, and pictures an evidently characteristic trait in the young Anglo-Saxon nobility of the time. With that there is the poetic habit of going one better than the facts, exaggerating the splendour and the luxury, the profuse employment of gold, in the manner no doubt of the typical *Märchen*, but not less in the manner of heroic poetry. One may be permitted to recall Nestor's cup in *Iliad*, XI, 632 ff., where the features of the possible original are doubled for the greater glory of the prince. If the author of *Beowulf* knew swords (as he must) with runic inscriptions on their golden pommels, it was easy for him to imagine a specially splendid example with no simple name or sentence but embellished with a whole poem, setting out thus (in some sort) a relation like that between the Ruthwell Cross and simpler memorial crosses.

One part of the Anglo-Saxon poem—the coming of *Beowulf*—has been generally and justly admired, and this part more than most has been felt to owe a debt to Virgil, perhaps as much as anything because it gives a vivid, realistic picture of historic truth; for it is history in the deep philosophic sense—an event which happened a hundred times generalised in one glowing picture. How could this untried Anglo-Saxon poet arrive at so impressive a result except by direct act of imitation? Few nowadays would consciously admit the idea that true heroic poetry is rude or even naïve, and everyone is well aware that such a work as *Beowulf* has centuries of tradition behind it, motives and phrases hammered out on the anvil of a thousand minds, but the old ideas unconsciously break through: they die hard, as hard as in the case of Shakespeare. The fact is that once we grant the idea of the coast-warden, and that at all events is not borrowed, though possibly derived from

English rather than Germanic tradition, all the rest follows not only naturally but inevitably. From the challenge down to Hrothgar's welcome everything is as characteristically Germanic and English as it can be, and must have been as familiar to the poet as sleep and food.

Another point which easily leads to misconception by undue emphasis is the retainer's obligation of loyalty, and especially in the matter of his deserting or surviving his lord. The well-known words of Tacitus are after all an ideal—an ideal not unknown in practice (cf. *Amm. Marc.* xvi, 12)—but like some other things in the *Germania* part of a fancy picture. The need for insistence on loyalty, the glorification of the devoted retainer, as in the Chronicle story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard (no doubt also based on a lay) and in *Maldon*, would hardly be so prominent if disloyalty, desertion, and betrayal were never known. It may be regrettable but the fact is that they were common enough as a glance at Bede or Gregory of Tours will convince even the sceptical, and to speak of 'a monstrous thing in defiance of the most fundamental principles of Anglo-Saxon loyalty' is to misconceive the situation grievously. Not even in Germanic antiquity did the retainers make a practice of sacrificing themselves hopelessly. Haethcyn's band did not die round their chief—nor Ongentheow's—and no reproach is suggested. If the eleven, or ten excluding Wiglaf, did not enter the battle with the dragon, neither did the thirteen deem it their duty to follow Beowulf under water against Grendel's dam though they judged their lord *in extremis*. Wiglaf's reproach is a kind of injustice with an explanation in a characteristic habit of the poet which will appear presently.

The criticism of Onela's behaviour to Wiohstan seems equally based on misconception. The author quotes with approval (p. 31) Chadwick's words in *Heroic Age*, p. 347: 'there can be no doubt that he ought to have taken vengeance on his knight.' Of course there can be every doubt. Dynastic struggles continually overrode all normal obligations, and naturally enough Onela took no vengeance on Wiohstan; on the contrary he rewarded him richly as Wiohstan expected. It is curious that some who rightly emphasise the figure litotes (rather *meiosis*) in the poem will not recognise its presence here. The fatal clash of kindred happened repeatedly in Germanic antiquity, and the desired and unavoidable solution, until at all events Christianity suggested the possibility of compulsory tonsure, was the destruction of one claimant. Does anyone believe that Hrothwulf took vengeance on the slayer of his cousin Hrethric? In fact Onela was himself Eanmund's slayer by the hand of his retainer Wiohstan in exactly the same way as Hygelac was the bane of Ongentheow, and the Germanic hero was probably rather more logical in judging such matters than the modern critic. In general it may be added that a conflict of duties *could* lead to a tragic issue, but there must have been many who like Oidilwald at Winwaed, when opposing duties were pulling in irreconcilable directions, preferred to do nothing. The relation between a man and his sister's son was, as is well known, notably close and intimate, but it did not prevent Edwin of

Northumbria from dispossessing *his* sister's sons and keeping them in exile as long as he lived.

A last point claims a word, all the more urgently because inseparable from a marked idiosyncrasy of the poet in his more elaborate descriptive passages. In the account of Beowulf's cremation the resemblances with that of Attila in Jordanes make it clear enough that it is derived from native tradition (whether poetic or memorial tradition is immaterial) even if as is also true much of the detail can be paralleled outside the Germanic peoples. The difficulties or discrepancies which have provoked doubts are due less to the poet's dependence on hearsay than to the fact that in accordance with his custom he describes a conventional cremation scene. In his hands the situation becomes typical, and the poet in part loses sight of the particular occasion. This tendency to make the situation typical is characteristic of all his descriptions, both of scenery and of events; they condense into the type. It is so of Freawaru and Ingeld, of the parting of Hrothgar and Beowulf, of the monsters' pool, of the flyting of Unferth and Beowulf, and others. Often too the poet's imagination plays round the scene, adding detail to detail, till the additions force the original purpose into the background and endanger or even destroy the artistic truth of the picture. This is very emphatically so of the old ceorl's lament in ll. 2444ff., no less so of the accounts of the burial of the dragon's gold, and of Wiglaf's rebuke of the 'cowardly' retainers. It is a weakness of the 'romantic' temperament that there is constant danger of sacrificing the whole to the part, and the mood of pensive melancholy that broods in luxurious grief on unhappy far-off things is very close kin to romance. The danger of taking these highly-wrought typical tableaux as sober evidence described with the eye fixed closely on the object should be apparent.

This notice seems to be occupied mainly in controverting the foundations of Mr Haber's study, but it ought not to end on that note. One reader at least has been pleasantly stimulated by this provocative work; it has forced him to look once more and rather closely at the grounds of his own faith. Every parallel put forward by Mr Haber or another is a challenge which sooner or later must be met, and it is always profitable if occasionally disconcerting to be faced with some subversive theory pushed as far as it can go; and though few epics seem less like *Beowulf* than the *Aeneid*, weighted with the fate of Rome and of the world, it is easy to understand the wish to make the greatest of Anglo-Saxon poems blossom under its shadow and borrow from its matchless grace.

RITCHIE GIRVAN.

GLASGOW.

Opera Hactenus Inedita T. Livii De Frulovisiis De Ferraria. Recognovit C. W. PREVITÉ-ORTON. Cambridge: University Press. 1932. xxxvii + 397 pp. 25s.

Tito Livio dei Frulovisi is best known to English students by the *Vita Henrici V*, which he wrote for Humphrey Duke of Gloucester during a visit to England in 1437. Dr Previté-Orton is not primarily

concerned with this, although he notes that better manuscripts are available than that used by Thomas Hearne as the basis for his edition of 1716. He gives us, however, with admirable scholarship, a general account of the writer's vexed career, and three works which have hitherto remained unprinted. One is the *De Republica*, a treatise on government, in a realistic vein more akin, as he points out, to that of Machiavelli than to that of the mediaeval tradition. It was written for Leonello d' Este of Ferrara, and is preserved in a manuscript at Reggio-Emilia. Another, given by Duke Humphrey to the University of Oxford, has disappeared. The second work is a verse *Encomium* of John Stafford, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Chancellor of England, to whom Frulovisi turned for succour after parting from the Duke. The third, of major interest from the point of view of literature, is a collection of neo-classic *Comoediae* from the library of Dr Previt -Orton's own college of St John's, Cambridge. They are written in scribal hands, but contain glosses, corrections and rubrics which may have been added by Frulovisi himself. And they belong to a very early period in the history of their kind. The rubrics and prologues to five of them, the *Corallaria*, *Claudi Duo*, *Emporia*, *Symmachus* and *Oratoria*, make it clear that these were composed at Venice during 1432-5, when Frulovisi was in charge of a school in the neighbourhood of St Mark's, and were in some way produced at festivals of his pupils. About the other two, the *Peregrinatio* and the *Eugenius*, there may be more doubt. They have no rubrics, although a blank space is left for one before the *Peregrinatio*, and may never have been produced. Dr Previt -Orton thinks that they belong to the time of Frulovisi's sojourn in England, and would even trace in some of the characters of the *Eugenius* adumbrations of Duke Humphrey, Henry VI, and other Englishmen, as well as of Frulovisi himself. I must own that, glad as I should be to find England brought so soon within the ambit of humanist drama, I do not see any very clear evidence of this. The *Peregrinatio*, no doubt, has scenes located in Britain, just as it has others in Rhodes and in Crete. But its prologue indicates that, although not intended for production in Venice, it was for an audience, some of whom might have heard the plays given there, and therefore presumably for an Italian audience. The locality of the *Eugenius* is Ravenna. The author has found a *doctissimum principem* from whom he expects *securum ocium*. He might be Humphrey of Gloucester, or even Henry VI. But might he not also be Leonello d' Este or some other Italian potentate? Little seems to be known about Frulovisi's movements in the year or two before he came to England.

The comedies are not remarkable either for their Latinity or their dramatic skill. The sedulous imitation of Plautus and Terence, in prose with some apparent traces of rhythm, is modified by the occasional introduction of abstract characters in the manner of the moralities. Their real interest lies in their evidence of actual performance, since this has not been forthcoming for any of the very few neo-classic examples of earlier date, or indeed for any before about the middle of the fifteenth century. But what kind of performance was it? Was it

'acting' in the full classical and modern sense? The rubrics to the five Venetian plays tell us that each was *acta*, and give in each case the name of the one who *egit*. He, in the *Corallaria*, was the speaker of the prologue, who in the *Claudi Duo* is called *recitator*. Dr Previté-Orton is inclined to suggest that there was full acting by Frulovisi's pupils in all of this series but the *Corallaria*, and he cites passages from the prologues which seem to put this beyond doubt. But the *Corallaria* itself he supposes to have been presented by professional *mimi*, who gesticulated in silence on the stage, while the *recitator* declaimed the Latin. This is no doubt the method by which mediaeval learning supposed the classical plays to have been given, but whether it was ever actually employed by the humanists and the difficulty of synchronisation faced, I do not think we know. The *recitator* of the *Claudi Duo* Dr Previté-Orton regards as relegated to the function of a mere prompter; perhaps 'presenter' would be the more exact equivalent. But is it necessary to assume such a fundamental change of method in the course of the series? Surely Frulovisi, fond of expatiating upon such things in his prologues, would have been more explicit about it, if it had taken place. May not the *Corallaria* have been fully acted, just like the rest? It is true that it had *mimi*, since Frulovisi complains that the intrigues of his enemies obliged him, when giving the *Claudi Duo*, to do so *sine mimis*. And he adds, 'Si desunt histriones, ornatus supplebit agentum industria et ingenium adulescentum nostrorum discipulorum.' For the next play, the *Emporia*, the *ornamenta* were *reddita*. A rival play, the *Magistrea*, had the advantage over the *Claudi Duo*, that it was allowed the services of *histriones*. But were those *mimi* or *histriones* actors? Both terms, in the fifteenth century, stand for 'minstrels' of all kinds. And I suspect that what Frulovisi wanted them for was not the play itself, but accompanying *entr'actes*; the *facetiae* and *ridicula*, perhaps, of which the prologue to the *Emporia* speaks, but still more music. All the five rubrics note persons who *modos fecere luditibiis*. And these contributions, rather than scenery and costumes, as Dr Previté-Orton suggests, may also be the *ornatus*. Hostile influences might well deprive Frulovisi of the services of a band of civic minstrels. One does not see how they could prevent him from putting up a simple range of *domus* before a back wall, such as we find in the illustrations to the Lyons *Terence* of 1493. Dr Previté-Orton assumes a gallery, but I doubt whether more than a raised *domus*, like that used for heaven in miracle-plays, would be necessary for any action not on the ground level. *Domus*, very slightly apart, would serve to represent distinct localities, although in the *Peregrinatio* Frulovisi extends the classical use of this principle to cover localities supposed to be in different countries. I need hardly say that it is from no want of gratitude and admiration for a most learned and valuable book that I have chiefly dealt in this brief review with the few points which seem to invite controversy.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

EYNSHAM, OXFORDSHIRE.

The Essential Shakespeare. By J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1932. viii + 148 pp. 3s. 6d.

The sub-title of this book is 'A biographical adventure.' Such an adventure by a distinguished Shakespearean scholar and editor of Shakespeare is bound to command the most respectful attention and to awaken the most lively hopes. The book is an attempt to describe in brief the life and character of the sort of man who must have written the plays, if Professor Dover Wilson's conception of the significance of the plays is to be satisfied.

Apart from a whimsical theory which places Shakespeare as a tutor to Southampton in 1593 and 1594, the main novelty in this new account of Shakespeare is the further theory that he was attached to the Essex party, and that this attachment and its results help to explain several of his plays and are largely responsible for a spiritual crisis, for a tragic mood, and for the great tragedies.

The fall of Essex, we are told, was the destruction of the hopes of England and of Shakespeare, and the advent of James of Scotland as residuary legatee of the throne 'ushered in a period of cynicism and gloom' (p. 36), in which Shakespeare shared. Paralysed by his sense of disaster for two years, from 1601 to 1603, he resumed writing only to produce bitter comedies and ruthless tragedies for some four or five years. He subsequently recovered, to produce the final plays of reconciliation. And on pages 129-31 Professor Dover Wilson debates with Sir Edmund Chambers concerning the diagnosis of Shakespeare's breakdown and recovery.

It may seem that there is little added in this to the views expressed by earlier generations of interpreters, except the partly historical explanation of the moods of Shakespeare. But this is indeed the root of the matter as I understand the argument, which must therefore stand or fall by the facts of history as far as they are known. For aesthetic interpretation of the plays eludes debate, and must largely be individual.

There will always be those, I trust, who will be recalcitrant to the notion of 'bitterness' in *All's Well* or *Measure for Measure*, or of an unbalanced or abnormal outlook in any of the plays of this period. Helena does not 'set my teeth on edge,' nor does Isabella (p. 116). This way, moreover, lies disintegration, a way which Professor Dover Wilson duly takes with respect to these plays (pp. 113, 117). There are again those who are unable to fathom why some people cannot see the poet of *Romeo and Juliet* in *Troilus and Cressida*. But when the answer really amounts to little more than that the objectors simply do not like this or that, there is an end of it.

History, however, deals with facts, not tastes. And when we are told that the fall of Essex made an end of England's hopes, and that with the reign of James

...the glory had departed; a shadow lay across the land, the shadow of the tomb; and the air seemed thick with the breath of corruption. James made short work with the 'spaciousness' of the old days: peace was concluded with Spain, and Raleigh shut up in the Tower (pp. 113-14),

we are bewildered by the complete neglect of established facts involved in such statements. Essex was popular enough, but never as claimant to the throne. To urge his claim was treason, yet we are asked to believe that Shakespeare supported it (p. 102) and tried to educate him by his plays, as in *Troilus and Cressida* (p. 101), for kingship.

The truth is that while Elizabeth lingered on, 'the shadow of the tomb' lay over the land, and the shadow of uncertainty, with the fear of men like Essex and of civil war. With the accession of James, universally accepted and welcomed, that shadow was lifted. The precious stability of England was assured. The legitimate heir himself, he also assured the succession in the male line, with two sons, of whom the elder, Henry, was in truth 'the darling hope of all' (p. 96). The peace with Spain was a wise and sane peace. James sought peace at home and abroad, as he hoped to bring religious peace too, and to put an end to the inquisition established under Elizabeth. He brought peace and union with Scotland, no mean gift. The Britain that haunted the imagination of Elizabethan Englishmen was once more Britain, one and undivided. And the first decade of the reign of James was a great period of achievement in all spheres of activity. It can boast of Bacon's great work, of the Authorised Version, of the foundation of the Virginia Company and of the American colonial empire. And it can boast of Shakespeare's greatest plays, to the production of which it contributed, not by any imaginary futility and hopelessness, but by the general and prevailing energy and active spirit of a great age, led by no mean statesman, and confident in its new stability. Against 'the true Elizabethan age, those halcyon days of happy ease' (p. 36), which came to a catastrophic end in 1601, according to Professor Dover Wilson, we may set the evidence of a contemporary, recorded eight years after the death of James,

Who favour'd quiet, and the arts of peace
(Which in *his halcyon days* found large increase).
(Falkland, in *Jonsonus Virbius*.)

Professor Dover Wilson has a difficult task when he seeks to reconcile his theory of Shakespeare's partisanship for Essex with Shakespeare's undoubted political orthodoxy, so often and so clearly expressed in the plays. A true Elizabethan, he abhorred civil war and held firmly to degree, order, and to the principle of legitimate succession. The truth is that no reconciliation is possible, and the main new theory falls to the ground, however gallantly and skilfully argued.

The alternative to the general position taken up in this book is by no means necessarily 'the calm, impersonal philosopher generally believed in' (pp. 116-17). I do not know who 'generally believes' in this conception of the great dramatist. But the attractiveness of such theories as these put forward in Professor Dover Wilson's book lies very largely in their appeal from this man of straw. There is something to be said for Sidney Lee, after all, who is the least romantic of Shakespeare's biographers. He makes us aware that Shakespeare lost his only son, Hamnet, in 1596, at the age of eleven. But for Professor Dover Wilson the rebellion and execution of a fascinating but unprincipled traitor were

‘—can we doubt it?—the most profound experiences he had ever passed through.’ Lee’s statement records a fact. The other is a theory deduced from a series of conjectures which, once made, are assumed to be facts. The process of thought is well illustrated in the elucidation of Chettle’s phrase ‘divers of worship,’ which is successively glossed as ‘persons of rank and distinction,’ ‘cultured men of rank,’ ‘worshipful gentlemen,’ and finally ‘noble patrons,’ the point which it is desired to reach to fit the phrase to the argument (p. 49), and to bring in Essex and Southampton.

Professor Dover Wilson brings his wide culture to bear upon his theme in a series of parallels, in the admirable desire to give life to critical thought. But not all his parallels will satisfy us of their cogency. That which sets together the years 1602 and 1932 as periods of despair involves an interpretation of the Great War and its sequels which would be hotly disputed by most (pp. 118–19). That which describes the spiritual crisis of Wordsworth as analogous to Shakespeare’s rests on an interpretation of Wordsworth’s attitude towards French affairs to which the *Prelude* offers a notable corrective, as in the lines

yet I feel...
The aspiration, nor shall ever cease
To feel it.

He never lost his faith in the ‘mirage’ (p. 135), and he faced without blenching the ‘blood and terror’ of the Revolution. The contrast with Goethe, ‘who seemed Athene-like to spring into the world in full panoply of philosophic calm’ (p. 9), conveys no conception of the young Goethe who meditated and feared suicide at Wetzlar. It is, indeed, Goethe who might have furnished Professor Dover Wilson with his most telling parallel for his interpretation of Shakespeare: ‘Wenn ich nicht Dramen schriebe ich ging zu Grund.’

The final chapter shows us Shakespeare in retirement at Stratford, and reports an imaginary monologue by the poet, in which one feels a touch of the yokel. The printing-press, as worked by ‘Neighbour Field,’ is a ‘new-fangled toy,’ it seems (p. 138). The dramatist, we are told, did not think of his plays (wrung out of him as some were in the blood and sweat of spiritual passion, according to Professor Dover Wilson) as literature or poetry. But Ben Jonson was not the only dramatist of the time who thought of plays, especially of tragedies, as poems or ‘works.’ And Shakespeare, too, knew well enough when he was writing poetry, and that it was not an alternative to gardening.

If there is something theatrical about such a conclusion, it is however true to say that the whole book deserves the higher title of dramatic. That is to say, it furnishes an interpretation of the works of Shakespeare and of his relations to his age which offers material for excellent drama, with a romantic hero who is a great dramatist. It is true that Professor Dover Wilson has improved on the facts, which do not offer such material. But his book is a creative work of imaginative distinction, written with felicity and conviction and with uncommon power. The book haunts the imagination of the reader, however much his reason may demur to it. It

is perilous reading, and it would be well for its readers to heed Professor Dover Wilson's own warning concerning part of it, that it is 'largely conjectural' (p. 61).

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Band 67. Herausgegeben von WOLFGANG KELLER. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1931. v + 148 pp. 8 M.

We have again to congratulate Professor Keller on bringing out another *Jahrbuch* and on having contributed to it the whole of the reviews of recent Shakespearean literature, including the great work of Sir Edmund Chambers. He has also written sympathetic appreciations of the work and character of Sir Israel Gollancz and Dr C. H. Herford.

We learn from the volume that the number of performances of Shakespeare's plays given in Germany in a year reached its maximum in 1923 when 2020 were given, and has since declined, owing to the competition of cinemas and shortness of money, to 1466 given by 133 different companies in 1930. By far the most popular play was *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

The first article is occupied with the English Reformation and shows the divergent influences which have swayed the English Church from the time of Henry VIII to the present day. The writer, Professor Herbert Schöffler, seems to go too far in saying the Reformation rested on 'no religious need.' The countrymen of the North may have resisted the change, but I think that thoughtful townspeople generally welcomed it. Dr Wolfgang Drews contributes an interesting account of the first German performance of *King Lear* given by F. L. Schröder's Hamburg company on July 17, 1778. The play was much altered to suit the classical taste of the time, in particular Cordelia did not die; but it was still deeply moving, and Moses Mendelssohn could not stay after the fourth act. Schröder's version continued to be played in Germany till 1847.

In connexion with English Shorthand in Shakespeare's time Dr Werner Kraner reproduces from a Leipzig MS. the British Museum original of *The Divine Prophecies of the Ten Sibyls* turned into Timothy Bright's shorthand system and presented to Queen Elizabeth by Jane Seager on New Year's Day, 1589. This is a valuable supplement to Bright's own account of his system in *Characterie*, 1588. The interest of the subject to Shakespearean scholars of course depends on the supposition that some of the quarto versions of the plays were, partly at least, shorthand versions of what was heard from the stage. Traces of the use of Bright's system have been found, we are told, by Otto Pape in *Richard III*, by Paul Friedrich in *The Merry Wives*, by A. Schöttner in *Romeo and Juliet*, and by Dr W. Kraner himself in *Henry V*. Dr Kraner's work appeared as *Die Entstehung der ersten Quarto von Shakespeares Heinrich V* (Leipzig, 1923). It is therefore remarkable that he makes no reference to the work of his predecessor, Dr Hereward T. Price, who about 1920 published *The text of Henry V* at Newcastle-under-Lyme (reviewed by Dr A. W.

Pollard in this review for Oct. 1921) and there claimed that the quarto text owed much to a man who had used Bright's system in the theatre.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

A Garland for John Donne, 1631-1931. Edited by THEODORE SPENCER.

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford.

1931. x + 202 pp. 14s.

This pleasantly produced volume contains eight essays done by various writers on topics suggested by the editor, not, he explains, for the purpose of making the garland a complete one, but for the purpose of making it representative of what 1931 had to offer. Nevertheless the garland is fairly complete, fitting all round the head and leaving no gaps—the actual poetry of Donne, which looked like being passed over, comes preface-wise into Mr George Williamson's essay on *Donne and the Poetry of Today*. Mr T. S. Eliot writes on *Donne in Our Time*, Mrs E. M. Simpson on the *Paradoxes and Problems*, Signor Mario Praz on *Donne and the Poetry of his Time*, Mr John Hayward on *Donne the Preacher*, Miss M. P. Ramsay on *Donne's Relation to Philosophy*, Mr John Sparrow on *The Date of Donne's Travels* and the editor on *Donne and His Age*.

For some of the contributors, one feels, the external coincidence of the tercentenary has been the cause of their writing as well as the opportunity for it. They have tendered bay leaves rather like these before. Miss Ramsay, for instance, apologises again and again for the inadequate space into which she is attempting to cramp her theme. All the time her fingers appear to be edging towards *Les Doctrines Médiévales chez Donne*, wishing she had its spaciousness over again, but perhaps realising that all she could do would be to rewrite the book in other words. Mr Eliot has said most of his essay before. There are certain overlappings, too, not this time in the biography of the writer, but between the work of the contributors to the *Garland* and that of other scholars which has been published independently while the *Garland* was printing. Mr Spencer explains that Mrs Simpson's article and her appendix on *Donne's Reading of Martial* were in his hands early enough to have been independent of 'any study of Donne's use of classical authors which may have appeared since.' And Mr Hayward's article happens to work some of the same ground as Mr John Sparrow worked in his contribution to the 1931 volume of *Essays and Studies*. The *Garland* has the look of not being altogether virgin crantz.

The most important essay in the book is undoubtedly Mr Sparrow's. It is long and closely reasoned from start to finish. One feels the detective-story excitement of watching a really competent brain tracking down dates and evidences, tightening the possible into the probable and the probable into the all-but-certain. An examination of the known facts and allusions brings him to the point where he can see exactly why Walton's account reads misleadingly. It appears, from a scrutiny of the discrepancies between the accounts of Donne's travels in the first two

editions of Walton's *Life*, that Walton muddled up what he had to say. Mr Sparrow ingeniously unmixes Walton's facts for him and the indications are as conclusive as they could well be 'that during 1594 Donne resolved to travel, and spent some time...in Italy and Spain; that he joined Essex's expeditions in 1596 and 1597, and not long after his return from them was engaged by Egerton.' Mr Sparrow finally asserts Walton's worth as a biographer rather than detracts from it: he concludes, 'Walton bears reliable witness to the date as well as to the extent of Donne's travels, and here—as very often—though his account is apparently improbable, on closer examination it appears that, in his circuitous and unsatisfactory way, he is telling us the truth.'

There is a good word due to Mr Williamson—for what he says of Donne's poetry rather than of Mr Eliot's and other modern poets. Signor Praz exhibits a pleasantly informed mind. Mr Spencer, in what is rather a suggestive outline than anything definitely provable, indicates how the spiritual biography of Donne coincided with the movements of contemporary thought.

I do not altogether agree with Miss Ramsay's arguments on p. 103 where she is showing that the metaphysical conceits, the 'tortuous similitudes' of the time were 'a natural and spontaneous mode of expression.' She takes the lines composed by Montrose in 1650 on the eve of his execution and, finding them very metaphysical, concludes, 'Surely at such a moment, if ever, feeling must find a form of expression natural to it!' This writing of a valedictory lyric before execution was almost a fashion. One remembers Sir Walter Raleigh and 'Throgmorton's Verses a little before he was executed.' Perhaps at such a moment the gesture was fashionable rather than sincere, and, being fashionable, attempted a manner of composing that would be recognisably literary. As Miss Ramsay points out, Montrose's lines have close resemblance to some of Donne's in the *Second Anniversary* and elsewhere. By 1650 Donne's style of writing had become anybody's mannerism. To adopt it gave one the look of being a poet.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

The Works of Thomas Otway: Plays, Poems and Love-Letters. Edited by J. C. GHOSH. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. Vol. I, xii + 520 pp.; Vol. II, viii + 542 pp. 40s. net.

A scholarly and trustworthy edition of Otway has long been a *desideratum*. Thornton's edition of 1813, in three volumes, which did duty for over a century, belonged to an uncritical age, and, with its modernised text, was eminently unsatisfactory, continuing a number of corruptions, and introducing others, although it professed to be based on a collation of 'the quarto copies and earliest editions.' The handsome Nonesuch edition of Mr Montague Summers, published in 1926, was the more treacherous because its pretensions were greater. The editor claims that, for the text of the plays, 'the first quartos are scrupulously followed,' and that all pieces included are accurately printed from the originals. In

point of fact—the writer speaks from experience—it is hardly possible to find a page of Mr Montague Summers's text with less than half a dozen variations from the original, and, not infrequently, the number is two or three times as great. A later edition has actually been followed with a partial assimilation of the readings and typography of the original quartos. Even the 'Textual Notes' to each play admit definite errors, and are not to be trusted. Nor does Mr Montague Summers furnish the student with a bibliography, beyond a summary list of eighteenth-century collected editions, and this is incomplete.

The modest and competent scholarship, accuracy in detail, and economy in the presentation of material exercised by Mr Ghosh are in pleasing contrast. If Otway has long been forgotten by the theatres his talents place him in the forefront of the second line of English dramatists writing in verse. It may be that few will be persuaded, but it is worth recording that Sir Edmund Gosse regarded *Don Carlos* as the best of our rhyming tragedies, not excepting Dryden. *The Orphan* was, in its own day, a splendid success; and it witnessed a number of revivals throughout the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth century. The stage success of *Venice Preserv'd* has been greater than that of all English plays save those of Shakespeare. Otway could write verse which, if it rarely reaches high poetic fervour, has movement, rhythm, and emotion. He could portray the passions and clash of temperament; and bring upon the stage living men and women. And he was little more than thirty-three when he died.

The text of Otway's plays presents no peculiar problems or difficulties. Beyond care and attention to the obvious slips the editor has a simple task. The first quartos, it is true, are not good examples of the printer's art. *Titus and Berenice*, *The Orphan*, and *The Souldiers Fortune*, in particular, are carelessly produced; but the errors are, for the most part, those of the printing house. In only three instances were second editions of the plays published during Otway's lifetime; and these hardly call for the recording of variants. Almost the only differences lie in typography, spelling and punctuation. With one exception, the Prologue to Lee's *Constantine the Great*, Mr Ghosh has adopted for his text the first edition of each work, reproducing (with some slight adaptation) the typographical characteristics and peculiarities of his original. Whenever corrections are made these are recorded at the foot of the page, so that the original text can be restored at a glance. The method adopted throughout in presenting the text is fully explained and rigidly observed. Brief additional textual notes are added for each play. The result is a text of Otway admirably edited; and, as a fairly extensive check at random has shown, thoroughly accurate.

The bibliography is also a well-tabulated and useful piece of work. Mr Ghosh arranges it in four sections to show the separate plays, poems and verse translations, prose works, and collected editions. All editions of the plays are entered to 1712, the date of the first collected edition of the works, twenty-seven years after Otway's death. An extremely rare quarto book, professing to be *The Works of Mr Thomas Otway*, printed

for R. Bentley, London, appeared as early as 1692. But this is merely a made-up volume, consisting of quarto editions of the plays of varying dates bound together. This may have been reissued, for the writer has a similar volume before him, the general title torn out, and the latest quarto dated 1705.

Mr Ghosh's bibliography is as accurate and scholarly as the rest of his work. It may be mentioned, however, in passing, that the possessive 's' of 'St Paul's,' on the title-page of the 1705 edition of *The Orphan*, should be italic and not roman as Mr Ghosh gives it. Further, although he notes that in the 1701 edition of *Titus and Berenice*... *With a Farce called the Cheats of Scapin* the farce is treated as a separate entity with its own signatures and pagination, he might have added that it is printed with a different fount, and, at least in some copies, on quite a different paper. It was, presumably, produced by another printing house.

The introduction, in general, is an example of neatness and precision. Its fault is almost too great a concentration and brevity; but this is a rare and pleasing gift. One or two odd turns of phrase call for amendment. For example, p. 11, 'He continues how in his adversity he came'; and, p. 52, 'he is much more preferable to.' Mr Ghosh's researches enable him to correct some commonly accepted errors, and to supplement what has hitherto been known of Otway's life. His father was buried at Woolbeding on February 9, 1671, not 1670 as stated by the *D.N.B.*, Mr Montague Summers, and Professor R. G. Ham (*Otway and Lee*, 1931, p. 13). In his introduction Mr Montague Summers falls into confusion relative to the period of Otway's residence at Oxford by misreading a passage in the Dedication to *Caius Marius*, which has reference to Winchester, not Oxford. He asserts that Otway 'could not have gone down before the end of 1672.' Mr Ghosh settles the whole point. Otway was admitted to Christ Church on May 12, 1669. His caution money was returned on September 28, 1671, within less than eight months of his father's death. Presumably he could no longer afford to remain; and he left, without a degree, after rather more than two years' residence. Mr Ghosh also clears up the puzzle relating to the grant of an M.A. degree to Otway by Cambridge. He accepts Anthony à Wood's account of Otway's death in an obscure tavern on Tower Hill as substantially correct, rejecting Theophilus Cibber's tragic embellishment and the picturesque story, recorded by Spence, that he died in consequence of the heated pursuit of a man who had murdered a friend named Blakiston, or Blackstone. One Blakiston was murdered, as Luttrell and contemporary newspapers relate, but in April twelve months before Otway's death. Despite this little difficulty Professor Ham is anxious to believe that there may be something in the story after all (*Otway and Lee*, p. 215).

In discussing the canon of Otway's writings Mr Ghosh is judiciously sceptical of several pieces which, on slender evidence, have found their way into the collected works. He definitely excludes as apocryphal the 'Epilogue at the Theatre in Drury Lane, 1680,' three translations from Tibullus, two short poems, 'The Enjoyment' and 'The Enchantment,' and the song beginning 'Health breeds care.' The last-named was ascribed

to Otway, on no real grounds assigned, by E. F. Rimbault (*Notes and Queries*, 1st series, v, p. 337). It was not even pretended that the manuscript from which it was taken was in the poet's hand. Why, on the evidence furnished, it should ever have been accepted at all it is difficult to understand. May a further doubt be hazarded? In 1923 (*Notes and Queries*, 12th series, xii, 103) Mr Ghosh questioned whether Mrs Barry was the recipient of the half-dozen love-letters ascribed to Otway and first printed in a volume of *Familiar Letters: Written by the . . . Earl of Rochester, And several other Persons of Honour and Quality*, 1697. He was then unaware of an advertisement in the 1713 and 1734 editions of Nathaniel Lee's works, to which Professor R. G. Ham drew attention (*Notes and Queries*, CXLIX, p. 165), in which the letters were said to be addressed to 'that excellent Actress Mrs. Barry.' Mr Ghosh in his present introduction recounts the stages of the tradition without comment, and does not press his case. If the addressee is in some doubt, are the letters themselves beyond question? The volume in which they first appear was edited by Tom Brown. We rely on his word for the authorship twelve years after Otway's death. Mr Ghosh, however, accepts them as genuine without discussion.

Otway's reputation rests not on his poems, still less on any doubtful pieces, but on the ten plays which Mr Ghosh has now edited almost impeccably. His edition is likely to serve the student at least as long as Thornton's, and not by default, but because it will be difficult to displace. The one shortcoming which some may feel is that, in an anxiety to avoid overburdening his author, he has been almost too sparing of annotation.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

ASPENDEN, HERTS.

E. AUDRA. *L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion. 1931. vi + 650 pp. 75 fr.

E. AUDRA. *Les Traductions françaises de Pope (1717-1825). Étude de Bibliographie*. Paris: H. Champion. 1931. xviii + 138 pp. 150 fr.

The title of M. Audra's book does not give a correct idea of its scope. French influence in Pope's work is only a part, although the most important part, of a larger subject, Pope's relations with France. Some of M. Audra's most interesting pages deal with Pope's French acquaintances and French criticism of the *Essay on Man*, and his second volume is a detailed testimony to the vogue of Pope's work in France, not only after his death but in his lifetime too. Pope, he asserts, is our first poet to enjoy a contemporary European reputation.

Pope's knowledge of French is a matter of more obvious importance. M. Audra judiciously considers his opportunities for learning French and the evidence which his works and various anecdotes supply for estimating how well he could understand the language. His reasoned conclusion is that though Pope was neither able to speak French fluently nor write it correctly, without any doubt he knew enough to read, understand, and appreciate French writers in the original [pp. 138, 148].

This prepares the ground for M. Audra's study of French influence on Pope. The subject is one whose importance has been realised since the time of Warton, but the issue of the study has frequently been obscured, as M. Audra points out, by an incomprehensible insularity which allows full influence upon Pope of English writers, but minimises the influence of a foreigner. It would have been comprehensible if M. Audra in reaction had seen French at every turn, but instead, we find that he has exercised commendable restraint: we can learn a little from this book of the influence of Waller and Denham, something about Pope's debt to Chapman in a section given to his use of Mme Dacier's work on Homer, and a great deal about the literary relations of Pope and Dryden. By French influence M. Audra does not merely understand isolated borrowings. It is more than that. Pope's use of French literature, he maintains, was the result of a sincere admiration for French critics and an unity of purpose with them. He would do for English poetry what Boileau, the most correct writer of the moderns, had done for French. M. Audra's business, therefore, is to trace all the stages of Pope's discipleship, his close attention to the recipes of Fontenelle and Rapin for making Pastorals, his variation on a theme of Boileau in the *Essay on Criticism*, and his adoption of the French ideals of translating Homer; with this is involved the acceptance of some French thought and some attention to French verse-technique. M. Audra thus sees in Pope's work a translation from the French, sometimes literal, sometimes more like a translation by Dryden, that is, an original poem on the same theme; and almost always the result is 'What oft was thought, but ne'er so well express'd.' A few differences of opinion are inevitable—for example, the additions which M. Audra has made on pp. 210-12 to Elwin's list of borrowings from the Soame-Dryden translation of the *Art poétique* I do not find convincing—but broadly speaking M. Audra's findings are acceptable as far as they go. It is true that M. Audra can find no direct French influence in the style of the *Essay on Man* and *The Dunciad*, and that he is aware of the danger of always approaching Pope from the south, but in spite of this he is too apt to consider his own conclusions characteristic of what other students will find approaching Pope from different directions.

Pour Pope en effet ce qui importe, c'est non pas l'inspiration, mais l'art. Et dans cet art même, la part fortuite, la part de l'intuition est réduite au minimum. L'art de Pope est un art savant, fondé sur la tradition, c'est-à-dire, selon sa propre expression, 'la connaissance du bon sens de nos prédécesseurs' [p. 614];

this will not do as a summary, for Pope's work is not merely the perfect expression of another man's thoughts, in itself an act of creation, as M. Audra rightly insists (p. 314); if we believe this, we have missed the fire and the personal emotion of his later work. But this is a bias which any reader can correct, and it does not affect the importance of M. Audra's work, which is a most thorough and scholarly study of one side of Pope's writings. We look forward to the promised sequel about Pope's influence on French literature.

A little more care should have been given to the mechanical part of the book. There are too many misprints. On at least two occasions the dates

of important documents have been omitted (pp. 62, 117). Frequently M. Audra has forgotten to give his references or referred to the wrong edition of a book. Uniformity is desirable here. Reference should be made to standard library editions when they exist, e.g., to Birkbeck Hill's edition of Johnson's *Lives*, to Singer's edition of Spence's *Anecdotes*, and to the editions of Tovey and Toynbee of Gray's *Letters*—all apparently unknown to M. Audra. And why has he not increased our debt by attempting a list of contemporary French criticisms of Pope, to which he makes such interesting references in the text (pp. 59, 60, 98)?

JOHN BUTT.

LONDON.

The Grumbler. An Adaptation by OLIVER GOLDSMITH with an Introduction and Notes by ALICE I. PERRY WOOD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xxii + 34 pp. 8s.

In the Henry E. Huntington Library in California there is a Licensor's Manuscript of a short farce by Oliver Goldsmith called *The Grumbler*, which has hitherto never been printed in full. Sir James Prior described the play in his *Life of Goldsmith*, and printed a specimen scene in his edition of 1837. Miss Alice I. Perry Wood has now transcribed the manuscript in full, and published it with a short introduction and commentary in the Huntington Library Series, issued in co-operation with the Harvard University Press. The book is pleasantly printed and produced, and it is illustrated with reproductions of old portraits of Goldsmith, of Quick, the actor, and of the playbill of Quick's benefit, when the farce was acted. It is a pity however that Miss Perry Wood has adhered to the exact lineation of the original MS., where the prose, as in many old English dramatic MSS., is chopped up into short lines about the length of blank verse. This piece of pedantry makes reading very unpleasant, and there is no justification for it, as the printers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries themselves did not adhere to the lineation of dramatic prose found in the MSS.

Goldsmith's *The Grumbler* is a mere trifle written, as Miss Perry Wood states, specially for John Quick, the actor, probably as a reward for his remarkable success in *She Stoops to Conquer*. But it has an interesting literary history. It is founded on an English version by Sir Charles Sedley of the famous French comedy, *Le Grondeur*, by Brueys and Palaprat, produced in Paris in 1691, and printed in 1693. Goldsmith has cut down Sedley's excellent English version of the original three-act play (which had already been adapted once for the stage by Garrick) to one act, and he has done the job so hastily that at one point the dialogue is unintelligible to anyone who has no acquaintance with the original. Nevertheless, it is right that every extant work, however slight, by an author of Goldsmith's eminence should be printed, and the transcription and publication of this manuscript are therefore justified as a contribution to the study of eighteenth-century literature. The chief value of such a work

naturally depends upon the accuracy of the transcript, which we have no means of testing, as the Huntington Library MS. is unique. However, Miss Perry Wood's scholarship, as displayed in her introduction and notes, does not inspire confidence. She seems to be entirely unaware of the existence of the present writer's *Sir Charles Sedley, a Study of the Life and Literature of the Restoration* (London, 1926) and of his edition of Sir Charles Sedley's *Poetical and Dramatic Works* (London, 1928). If she had consulted these books, she might have been saved from some of the serious inaccuracies that detract from the value of her work. She would have found, for example, that the edition of Sir Charles Sedley's works published in 1778, which she appears to have used, is the last and least accurate of the old editions of Sedley's writings. She would also have discovered that Sedley's *The Grumbler* was not printed in 1702, as she incorrectly states, misled apparently by a mistake in an endorsement of the manuscript of Goldsmith's play. The first edition of Sedley's *Poems* certainly appeared in that year, but if Miss Perry Wood had seen a copy of that edition, she would have known that it contains no plays. *The Grumbler* first appeared in the edition of Sedley's works that was published in 1722, and it was reprinted in the subsequent editions of 1776 and 1778. It is comprehensible that a scholar in America should not have access to the early editions of Sedley's works, which are rare even in England, but it is surprising to find ignorance of a recently published work, where an accurate text and a complete bibliography of Sedley's writings are easily available. A minor defect is the omission to reprint the complete cast of the production of Goldsmith's play as given by Sir James Prior in his edition of 1837.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

* SOUTHAMPTON.

English Biography in the Eighteenth Century. By MARK LONGAKER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. 519 pp. 21s.

The vogue of biography as an art is still in the ascendant. After Dr Stauffer's *English Biography Before 1700*, Mr Longaker's *English Biography in the Eighteenth Century*. Soon the whole area will be pegged out, for literary movements to-day resemble nothing so much as a gold rush. The diggers are for the most part Americans, and generally the work is solid and painstaking, which is what one normally looks for in such undertakings. The intensive study of literary kinds seems to suit the genius of American scholarship, which approaches its problems much more from the laboratory point of view than is customary in this country. It would seem that Brunetière's heresy of the biology of literary species is receiving belated support from the American legions, but perhaps these studies of isolated form are not meant to imply any theory of literary workmanship, though the writers as a rule seem to be positively as happy when recording the mediocre writings of forgotten people as when extolling the works of genius. Genius, we remember, in Brunetière's theory

was the disturbing 'monster' that deflected the plant-like growth of species, and perhaps Mr Longaker felt something of this disturbance when he came to crown his book with an account of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. It is a creditable account, but it seems to stand rather outside the book, and is, as it were, 'of a higher strain.'

Some readers may be frightened off by the mere weight and circumstance of this book, but the hardier stock of readers will have their reward. Mr Longaker's type of scholarship might easily be mistaken for pedantry by the unwary, and no doubt the book suffers, at least on this side of the Atlantic, from the fact that the author does not always assume enough on the part of the reader. The account of the *Lives of the Norths* for example seems to call for a crisper treatment which should glance more flittingly at the rise of parties in the Restoration age. Also, why linger (pp. 334-9) so lovingly over the details of Johnson's career before he sat down to write the *Lives*? This apart, wherever the author leads us, we feel we are being personally conducted by a cicerone of unusual gifts of curiosity and understanding, a cicerone too who threads his way through eighteenth-century literary slumdom with rather more assurance than the upper regions of polite letters. I can understand a reader complaining that Mr Longaker in his chapter 'The Growth of Realism' has gone rather too thoroughly into the obscure annals of crime, and raked together a mass of rogue stuff which never had any pretensions to being literature. But Newgate being, as it was, one of the great feeders of eighteenth-century fiction, the student will be grateful for this thorough investigation of the vulgar annals of crime.

I think the distribution of the chapters in Mr Longaker's book excellent, but naturally in any arrangement there are drawbacks. The book may be supposed to lead up to Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*. Sir Walter Raleigh had treated the *Lives* with admirable gusto in his *Six Essays on Johnson* (1910), and he was able to give them their proper setting by describing previous efforts of a similar kind. Mr Longaker does this much more fully, but he allows a chapter on Mason's *Memoirs of Gray* to intervene with the result that we lose the feeling of progressive growth in the kind. Mason had to come in, of course, and he deserves his chapter, though the common notion that he devised an entirely novel biographical method in his *Gray* is admirably countered by our author. In no respect is his book more valuable than in the pains he takes to show that the use of letters in biography was a slow growth dating from as far back as Walton. He suggests indeed that in the age which utilised the letter for almost every literary purpose, it would have been strange if somebody had not stumbled on its extensive utilisation for biographical purposes. Conyers Middleton admitted letters into his *Life of Cicero* and so 'left the facts to speak for themselves' (Middleton's own very modern expression), and North had used it in the life of his brother Dudley.

The bibliographical matter, so important in a work of this kind, is full, and the arrangement at the ends of the chapters convenient. Mr Longaker's style is rather expansive, and his matter, extensive as it is, could have been compressed without loss of clearness. He has words enough

and uses them with average craft, though one does not like to see the adjective 'engaging' so sadly overworked.

But these are small blemishes in a book I have enjoyed reading.

G. KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

A History of 'Early American Magazines. By LYON N. RICHARDSON. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1931. xi + 414 pp. \$ 5.00.

In eighteenth-century America the publication of books and pamphlets was less extensive than in England, and in some of the colonies political or theological preoccupations tended to limit the subjects of books which were printed. In these and in other colonies, English books were imported freely, so that there was relatively little incentive for the American reader of *belles lettres* to turn to native products, and equally little incentive for the American publisher to spend his type and paper on books of verse, of light essays, or of fiction. This being so, the student of American literature or American intellectual history finds special interest in the eighteenth-century American magazine. Its pages offered practically the only place where the native writer with a taste for *belles lettres* might publish, and constitute probably the most accurate index of the literary taste of the American readers of the time. Dr Richardson's book, therefore, deserves to be greeted warmly by scholars as the first work to treat with anything like fullness American magazines in the eighteenth century, and as an extremely useful and well-indexed collection of data on the history of these magazines and their contents.

Dr Richardson discusses the magazines published from 1741 to 1789. There are thirty-seven. In everything which can be expressed in terms of precise data, discoverable by patient research, the book is thoroughly adequate. It by no means exhausts the possibilities for interpretation of what was published or for critical or historical appraisal of the material, but a book which did would have to assume the proportions, and to some extent the character, of a critical history of many aspects of American intellectual life for most of an important century. Since Dr Richardson has done what he has done so well, he has supplied invaluable material for the scholar who may some day make out of his crowded pages a full critical study.

The book is clearly based on painstaking research. Now and then the discussion of individual magazines is greatly improved because Dr Richardson has been able to use files with contemporary annotations by an editor or a contributor. The general method of the work and the accuracy with which the results are presented deserve praise. There are a few misprints, of course, but very few—for example, *lengthly* (p. 27). There are, as there must be in a book of this size, a few errors or confusions on matters of fact. There is a reference to Cotton Mather's defence of 'Scaevola' (p. 160), although at the time under discussion Cotton Mather had for a long time been in his grave. 'The Death Song of a Cherokee Indian' is referred to as a poem by Philip Freneau (p. 330),

although it is pretty well agreed that he did not write it. Dr Richardson speaks of Joseph Nancrède as the first instructor in French at Harvard, quoting as his authority an article written in 1913. In the preface to the first volume of the printed edition of the *Harvard College Records*, published as Vol. xv of the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, Dr Richardson might have found full information about earlier instructors in French at Harvard. It would almost certainly be easier to use the bibliography for some purposes at least if it were arranged alphabetically or indexed; the thorough index which covers most of the rest of the volume does not include the bibliography. The book as a whole is not likely to be read through by anyone except the most meticulously ardent student, since it is not stylistically attractive, but it is certain to become, as it deserves, an invaluable work of reference which no student of American life or letters in the eighteenth century can possibly afford not to consult.

KENNETH B. MURDOCK.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Romantic Quest. By H. N. FAIRCHILD. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. viii + 444 pp. 28s.

This book makes no claim to be a complete history of the romantic movement. It aims at giving 'an interpretative analysis and synthesis of the chief tendencies' of the age of Wordsworth. Professor Fairchild's method is not to define romanticism and then proceed to illustrate it. Rather he decides to advance inductively until a point is reached when definition becomes a necessity. As early as the second chapter, however, what he regards as the symptoms of romanticism are indicated—'the heart as opposed to the head, preference of country to town, sensibility, sentimental primitivism, humanitarianism, interest in medieval literature.' But the definition is not given until more than half-way through the book. It is somewhat lengthy, but in a nutshell, it is 'the desire for illusion.' More than once Professor Fairchild seems to approximate to Professor Lascelles Abercrombie's view, yet, strangely enough, though *The Romantic Quest* displays a commendable intimacy with the literature of the subject and though it introduces the reader to numerous works for private study, no reference is made to Abercrombie's *Romanticism*. Familiarity with it ought to have entailed certain modifications in the present form of the book.

Professor Fairchild does not pretend to see the world with the eyes of a romanticist but, apart from a stray remark here and there, he does not reveal his anti-romanticism until the end and even then he warns his reader that 'Our personal notions are seldom important enough to justify us in condemning a great artist for not agreeing with them.' He is aware that the views which he puts forward are necessarily subjective and he is tolerant towards those who think differently. In dealing with the complex problems of romanticism he frequently displays subtlety and elasticity as well as learning, and his book warrants his hope that not only students but also experts will find it worth reading. To give but one

example, his remarks on Shelley's relation to Sir William Drummond are of considerable interest.

A few detailed comments may be offered. In speaking of parallels to the Pantisocratic longing for America, mention might be made of Blake's *Thames and Ohio*, and in the same chapter Southey is dismissed rather curtly. When discussing the anti-intellectualism of Keats and Shelley, Professor Fairchild might have quoted their letters. Thus there is a significant passage in a letter dated December 22, 1817, in which Keats expresses his disapproval of 'irritable reaching after fact and reason' and criticises Coleridge for 'being incapable of remaining content with half-knowledge.' And while staying at Cwm Elan in 1811 Shelley wrote two letters which serve as an illuminating commentary on Keats's opinions. In any case, one feels that the passage quoted by Professor Fairchild from *Lamia* presents an incomplete picture of Keats and it is unfortunate that the plan of the book relegates to a much later chapter an account of the poet's subsequent ideas. On p. 194 the statement is made that after the period of his finest poetry, Wordsworth 'lost the capacity to rejoice in sensations of sight and sound and smell and touch and taste for their own sake.' We must recall that he never possessed the sense of smell, with the exception of the brief interlude described by Southey (*Life and Correspondence*, ed. by C. C. Southey, I, p. 63) which came to him as 'a vision of Paradise.' On p. 258 reference is made to the divorce which took place in the nineteenth century between history and literature. The separation was, however, not complete. In the latter part of the century and in the twentieth there is a striking growth in the historical consciousness, and history, particularly pre-history, has inspired both poets and prose-writers. One more observation regarding Professor Fairchild's account of the mediævalism of the romanticists. He interprets the term freely and we acquiesce, but when the influence of Milton on Wordsworth is discussed under this head, we feel inclined to protest. And in connexion with Keats, does not *Isabella* merit examination?

The Romantic Quest is an expansion of a series of lectures and much of the original form has been retained. It has at times an attractive raciness of phrase, as when it says that 'Knowing that the constitution of England has grown like an oak, Burke distrusts the sort of constitution that is suddenly assembled like a Ford car,' or that Joan of Arc was 'a simple peasant girl who saw so much more than apples in the orchard,' but we must confess to having been puzzled by a 'bright young debunker'!

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR, NORTH WALES.

Hartley Coleridge: Poet's Son and Poet. By HERBERT HARTMAN. London: Oxford University Press. 1931. 205 pp. 15s.

In the excellent brief memoir of Hartley Coleridge which prefaces the two-volume edition of the *Poems*, 1851, edited by his brother Derwent, the claim is made that Hartley is 'an instance where the poetic faculty, contrary to what has been laid down as a rule, seems to have been trans-

mitted by natural descent.' Mr Hartman does not attempt to deal with the complex problem of hereditary genius, despite the sub-title of his book, and so he carries us into the question no deeper than does Derwent, who, while he had a peculiarly intimate knowledge of his brother's earlier years, was not in possession of the modern psychological equipment now available to us all. Rather he has chosen to deal with the work of this strange Telemachus of poetry as he is in his individuality, without making too strenuous an endeavour to connect him with Odysseus, his mighty sire. This lesser task Mr Hartman has performed most capably, for we rise from the reading of the book with a clear conception of Hartley's poetry and prose, the delicacy of a few of his sonnets, the distinction of his style, and the sound judgment of portions of his critical essays. We are made to feel why it was that the man, who knew all too little the art of ordering life well, was the beloved 'li'le Hartley' to very many friends, and why he has become one of the legendary figures of Lakeland.

Mr Hartman might have brought out more clearly the striking fact that, though our poet was the son of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, he was the literary inheritor of his uncle Robert Southey and of his guardian William Wordsworth. By so doing Mr Hartman might have illustrated one of the many ironies which presided over the life of our beloved vagabond; but perhaps such literary relationships were regarded as too obvious to be worth indicating.

One connexion with Wordsworth Mr Hartman has very much over-emphasised: a connexion in which Hartley is pictured not as the borrower but as the lender. In chapter v, 'The "Darling" of the Ode,' he argues that the child Hartley 'impelled' Wordsworth to write *Intimations of Immortality*. As Mr Hartman's opinion is shared by Garrod, Pomeroy, and others, it should be pointed out that Wordsworth was by no means dependent on the child Hartley for his intimate knowledge of children. It is very true that Wordsworth knew Hartley from birth until long after he was 'a six years' darling,' but we should also remember that from September, 1795, to September, 1798, he lived with Basil Montagu and watched his development, his little occupations, and his insatiable curiosity, through the child's third, fourth and fifth years. The *Anecdote for Fathers* and *We Are Seven* belong to those years, and neither poem can reflect a knowledge of children derived from Hartley, who was not born until 1796. Just the other day Professor de Selincourt made available evidence that certain passages in *The Prelude* which parallel the central idea of the *Ode* had their origin at least as early as the Goslar days, that is, 1798-1799 (*Times Literary Supplement*, November 12, 1931). They show that the poet had at this time a full realisation of the infinitude and visionary quality of the child's consciousness and of the development of the mind from consciousness to consciousness:

Those beauteous colours of my early years
Which make the starting-place of being fair
And worthy of the goal to which she tends
Those hours that cannot die and lovely forms
And sweet sensations which throw back our life

And make our infancy a visible scene
 On which the sun is shining.
 Those recollect(ed) hours that have the charm
 Of visionary things—
 Islands in the unnavigable depth
 Of our departed time.

These and other early passages show clear parallels to those lines in the great *Ode* which speak of the inevitable yoke, and plainly set forth the great but unwelcome truth that the child must learn to live in reconciliation with our stunted powers and to endure the vassalage of life. They also show that when Wordsworth dictated the Fenwick note in 1843 he told the simple truth. He says he is not inculcating a belief in the Platonic doctrine of pre-existence, but merely using it to symbolise that dream-like vividness and splendour which invest objects of sight in childhood. This dream-like quality is the fundamental thing in the *Ode*: the notion of pre-existence is presented as a means of bringing our minds to a realisation of that quality. It is *as if* the child came from afar.

One word more. For years Hartley Coleridge was a pensioner on the bounty of Wordsworth, a frequent visitor, and a borrower of his books. He lies buried in Wordsworth's plot in Grasmere churchyard. It seems a strange thing to accuse Wordsworth of prevarication in this Fenwick note on the supposition that he was ashamed of the bedraggled Hartley of 1843; an accusation based not on evidence but on an interpretation of the poem which the poet himself expressly repudiates.

Mr Hartman's volume is all in its make up that we expect from the Oxford University Press. It is provided with a good index, and with a scholarly bibliography. Let one small but interesting item be added: COLERIDGE, HARTLEY: *Life of Andrew Marvell*, Hull, 1853.

ARTHUR BEATTY.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

MAURICE HALPERIN. *Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans la littérature anglo-américaine au XIX^e et au XX^e siècles*. Paris: Jouve et Cie. 1931. 146 pp.

Studies in comparative literature such as this which Mr Halperin has undertaken, may, perhaps, attempt three things: they may merely describe the various versions of the story in question, and point out the specific differences between these versions; they may go further and attempt a critical evaluation of these versions, as compared one with another; and, if they are ambitious, they may attempt to draw more general conclusions concerning the characteristics of the writers and of the national literatures discussed, as exemplified by these versions. Mr Halperin succeeds admirably in his primary task of description and analysis; he is less successful when he attempts criticism; and he refrains entirely from drawing conclusions. Hence his work is valuable as an academic study, but not inspiring as an essay in literary or aesthetic interpretation.

His subject matter is as interesting as could be asked. After summing

up briefly the mediæval versions of the legend of Tristan and Iseut, and describing at greater length the operatic version of Wagner, he devotes a chapter each to the versions of Arnold, Tennyson, Swinburne, Hardy, Mr Edwin Arlington Robinson, and Mr John Masefield. He adds to this three chapters concerning the renderings of the story by lesser writers, English and American. And finally he adds a three-page 'Conclusion.' He is most successful when he points out how differently these authors have dealt with their material—as, for instance, in their acceptance, symbolic explanation, or rejection, of the incident of the love philtre. He touches briefly on many interesting and suggestive facts, such as that most modern authors have changed the colour of the hair of the two Iseuts—Iseut of Ireland now being commonly described as dark, and Iseut of Brittany as golden-haired. But he makes practically no attempt to elaborate these interesting comparisons.

Mr Halperin does express very definitely his critical preferences; but the reviewer, for one, does not care much for them. Mr Halperin is a worshipper at the shrine of Swinburne. He speaks of his *Tristram of Lyonesse* as 'véritable chef-d'œuvre de la poésie lyrique anglaise.' This seems rather extravagant. And he goes on to select for praise one of Swinburne's worst conceits: 'And their four lips became one burning mouth,' calling it: 'vers brillant et expressif.' All of his criticism is not as bad as this, however, even when he becomes a little contemptuous of Arnold and Tennyson. Professor Cestre, his master, at least persuaded him that Mr Robinson's poem was worthy of respect.

Where Mr Halperin's study most falls short is in the matter of generalised interpretation. His 'Conclusion' ends lamely, repeating that the various versions are remarkable chiefly for their variety. He does not attempt to generalise upon the different facts suggested in the course of the study (such as that of the colour of the hair of the two Iseuts, which is usually symbolic); nor does he attempt to draw any conclusions concerning the differences in the treatment of the two legends by English and American authors. The American versions are strikingly psychological, while the English seldom are.

When all has been said in criticism, it remains true that Mr Halperin has completed a very workmanlike study. It may well suggest to others the possibility of a more unified and interesting treatment of the materials which he has gathered together.

FREDERIC I. CARPENTER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Meaning and Change of Meaning. By GUSTAF STERN. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, XXXVIII, 1932.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerbers. 456 pp. 15 kr.

Dr Stern states that the aim of his book is 'to establish a theoretically tenable and practically workable system of classification comprising all known types of sense-change.' The plan he has followed has been '(1) to try to ascertain, as precisely as possible, on the basis of typical and well-

authenticated instances, what has really happened to the meanings investigated; (2) to explain, with the help of adequate psychological theories, the conditions, causes, and nature of these changes.' The chief topics dealt with in Part I, Chapters 1-6, are the definition of verbal meaning; the analysis of meaning; the production of speech (largely dealing with Head's theories about aphasia and Selz's experiments on sentence formulation); and the comprehension of speech. In Chapter 7, beginning of Part II, Dr Stern first defines briefly the seven types of meaning change (which he says are first established empirically without reference to theory), and then classifies these seven types systematically on the basis of the theory of general causes and conditions of meaning change which he has developed in Part I.

Dr Stern's seven types are 'substitutions,' 'analogy' (e.g. *ascendentes* in the sense of *ancestors*, *black-letter day*, *brothel*), 'shortening' (e.g. *knock off*, *Underground*, *private*), 'nomination,' 'transfer,' 'permutation,' and 'adequation.' Substitutions are sense changes due to external, non-linguistic causes (e.g. *dinner*, *booking-office*). Nomination or 'intentional transfer' includes two types; the first type may be illustrated by the word *nomination* (as adapted by Stern to the purpose of naming this type of meaning change); the second type, in which emotional factors are involved, consists of figures of speech, especially metaphor, euphemism and irony. Transfer may be illustrated by the changes of meaning which have taken place in the words *bridge*, *mouth*, *keen*. Permutations are changes of meaning which originate in equivocal *phrases* and may be illustrated by *boon*, *board* (meaning *food*), *danger*, *batch*, *fare*. Adequations are of two kinds, those which complete a preceding change of meaning and those which do not. The latter class may be illustrated by German *anziehen*, originally meaning to *draw on*, and later to *put on*, an article of dress; this type of adequation includes what are commonly referred to as generalisation and specialisation of meaning.

Of these seven types, permutations and adequations are by far the most interesting and the most important. Changes of the first type, substitutions, result from external, non-linguistic causes. Changes belonging to types 2, 3, 4, and 5 are effected by the speaker, and the hearer's part is only to understand. In permutations and adequations, however, the change of meaning originates in the apprehension of the hearer. The words *boon* or *anziehen*, for example, may be used by the speaker in the sense of *request* or *draw on*, but may be apprehended by the hearer in the sense of *thing asked for*, or *put on*. Moreover we find that changes of meaning belonging to the first five types must usually be followed by adequation in order to become permanent and complete. The clearest illustration of this is in metaphors, euphemism, and hyperboles, which do not result in permanent changes of meaning until they have lost their emotional content and are apprehended in a non-figurative way. Whether this 'fading' of figures of speech is identical with adequation, as Dr Stern seems to imply, or whether at least a partial 'fading' precedes adequation, seems uncertain.

Dr Stern's distinction between permutations and adequations is not

entirely clear to me. Both originate in changes of subjective apprehension of the referent, but on p. 404 he says that all permutations are followed by adequations, which might seem to imply that it is only changes of this last type which originate with the hearer.

Dr Stern's psychological analysis of meaning and changes of meaning is based upon his critical study of an extensive relevant literature in the fields of psychology, logic, semasiology, and general linguistics. His bibliography includes upwards of 300 titles, a large number of which are specifically cited and discussed. The psychological studies which he uses are chiefly of the older, more abstract type exemplified by the work of Wundt, Bühler, etc. The purpose of most of the experimental studies he cites is not so much to ascertain *what* reaction the subject of the experiment will make to the stimulus presented to him, but rather to place him in a situation where he will not merely react to the stimulus but will produce an introspective report of his experience. I cannot but think that a better basis for the analysis of verbal meaning and changes of verbal meaning might be found in a different psychological approach. Meaning attaches not to words merely but to all types of experience. *Fountain pens, red buses, mud puddles*, and other items of experience acquire meanings and undergo changes of meaning just as words, phrases, and sentences do. I would suggest that the problem of verbal meaning might very profitably be investigated from this more concrete point of view; and that there is much in psychological literature of the more objective (behaviouristic, if you will) type, dealing with learning, habit formation, conditioned responses, etc., that would contribute to our understanding of how non-linguistic as well as linguistic experiences acquire and change their meanings. Dr Stern would seem to me well qualified to undertake such an investigation. He has a sound understanding of the fundamental nature of linguistic processes and his book is full of excellent observations which evidence this. He is apt to be at his best when he is at a good distance from his authorities and when he is developing his own ideas rather than reconciling or refuting the opinions of other investigators.

SAMUEL MOORE.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.

Góngora. Introduction, traduction et notes par LUCIEN-PAUL THOMAS. (Les Cent Chefs-d'œuvre Étrangers.) Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1931. 167 pp. 5 fr. 50.

The Solitudes of Don Luis de Gongora. Translated into English verse by EDWARD MERYON WILSON. Cambridge: W. Heffer. 1931. xviii + 80 pp. 5s.

Recent translations of Góngora into German, French and English impose the query how far his innovations remain valid after three centuries. Tongues lacking declensions are necessarily refractory to his extreme Latinisation of syntax, and though M. Thomas claims that 'c'est en grande partie à la façon dont il violenta sa tendance à se cristalliser que l'on doit l'extrême liberté et l'extrême plasticité de la

syntaxe castillane d'aujourd'hui,' this aspect of Gongorism did not take deep root in Spain. Still less are French and English capable of reflecting it. On the other hand the attempt to renovate poetic vocabulary and imagery has lost none of its pertinence, and this to some extent does admit of translation. A second query concerns the degree to which translation of such an author should involve interpretation. To translate Góngora one must understand him—and here all translators agree in 'paying homage to D. Dámaso Alonso's prose version of the *Soledades*, the veritable corner-stone of their edifice—but to make him understandable to the plain man is to jettison the essentials of his achievement.

It would seem, then, that Góngora in any other tongue should still be 'obscure.' On this point Mr Wilson's brilliant rendering of the *Soledades* appears to us more satisfying than the selected versions of M. Thomas (the *Polifemo*, about one-third of the *Soledades* and a number of short poems). M. Thomas's unrimed lines, ranging from three to fifteen syllables, allow a close approximation to the sense of his original, but his formlessness can scarce commend itself save as translation, and, when no exact equivalence offers, we miss the metrical restraint that would demand a substitution equally pregnant. To render 'erraba' by 'd'un endroit à l'autre allait et venait,' 'hidrópica' by 'avide,' 'esfinge bachillera' by 'sphinx plein de faconde impertinence' is to dilute an art all quintessence. Such dilution corresponds, of course, to the series in which the volume appears, as do the abundant foot-notes. Mr Wilson, who has adopted a riming scheme of six and ten syllabled lines that corresponds very closely to Góngora's, is no less bold in vocabulary than the Spaniard. He adds, it is true, occasional obscurities of his own: such as 'all the essential powder of our age' for 'la pólvora del tiempo más preciso,' which is only intelligible in virtue of a pun in the original; but the measure of his triumph over such an original invites, we think, serious attention to his poem even without reference to the Spanish. Here is more than a *tour-de-force*; it is poetry transplanted, with vigorous promise of fresh fruit. And withal most charmingly presented by the publisher.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

HENRIK IBSEN. *Œuvres complètes*. Traduites par P. G. LA CHESNAIS. II. *Œuvres de Kristiania* (1850–1). III. *Œuvres de Bergen* (1851–7). Paris: Plon. 1930, 1932. 496 pp. and 642 pp. Each 60 fr.

Since my first notice of this magnificent edition of the works of Ibsen in French translation (*Modern Language Review*, xxvi, pp. 231 ff.) two further volumes have appeared, carrying Ibsen's literary production down to *Fru Inger paa Østraat*. I can only repeat what I then said of volume I, and especially of M. La Chesnais' editorial matter. His work maintains its promise to be, besides a faithful rendering into French of all that Ibsen wrote, 'the most exhaustive of all books on Ibsen, critical and biographical.' It will be indispensable to every student, whether he

desires to have Ibsen's works in French translation or not. In these two volumes the introductory matter, apart from appendices and notes, covers no less than 340 pages. I am again impressed by M. La Chesnais' fairness and good judgment, his exhaustive familiarity with the literature on Ibsen, even down to articles in inaccessible Norwegian newspapers, and the lucidity of his criticism. Some of his chapters, indeed, I have read a little ruefully in finding in them themes discussed which, years ago, I had noted as calling for deeper investigation, but which the pressure of more immediate work has so far prevented me from taking in hand. He deals exhaustively with Ibsen's mission abroad in 1851, as far as his stay in Copenhagen is concerned; but I think that the subsequent weeks in Dresden, on which M. La Chesnais has little to say, deserve more careful consideration. The stimulus which Ibsen's first contact with the German theatre gave to his own dramatic work and to his views on the mission of the drama was no doubt important. The outstanding event during Ibsen's stay in Dresden was a 'Gastspiel' of the famous actor Dawson who appeared in *Hamlet* (twice), *Richard III*, *Emilia Galotti* and Holtei's *Lorbeerbaum und Bettelstab*; but, apart from this, the literary fare offered by the Dresden theatre during his stay was unfortunately mediocre, and yet perhaps not altogether without value. It is particularly disappointing to find that he had no opportunity of witnessing on the stage the outstanding German play of these years—and one which was closely associated with Dresden—*Der Erbförster* by Otto Ludwig. I have always been inclined to ascribe to that play some share in moulding Ibsen's prose dialogue. In his subsequent volumes M. La Chesnais will, I hope, have more to say about what Ibsen learned from Hettner's little book on *Das moderne Drama*.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

A very delightful and varied menu is provided by Vol. xvii of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, collected by Sir W. H. Hadow (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. 105 pp. 7s. 6d.). Mr C. S. Lewis contributes an illuminating discussion of 'What Chaucer really did to *Il Filostrato*,' ending with a philosophico-critical reflection that will rejoice some readers. From this exposition of Chaucer's mediæval zest we turn to 'Jorrock: a Conversation,' in which Professor W. L. Renwick sets forth sound reasons for his delight in Surtees, who also had the gift of gusto, in a lively dialogue. The Provost of University College writes on 'English Place-Names and their Pronunciation,' a question made acute by elementary education and its voluble child, Broadcasting. Dr Mawer's bias is, rightly, in the direction of 'genuine conservatism in pronunciation.' But education is going to be too much for us, and Hallborn treads on the heels of Syrencester, while Tinmouth is relegated to the upper classes.

The Archbishop of York writes wisely upon 'Poetry and Science,' M. André Maurois on 'Proust as a disciple of Ruskin,' Dr R. W. Chapman on 'Boswell's Archives,' and there is a pleasant essay by Mr J. A. Fuller-Maitland on 'Music and Letters.' A few misprints have escaped attention, e.g. *transporté* (p. 32), *Triolus* (p. 68). C. J. S.

We must apologise for only drawing attention to the second volume of *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies* (edited by William J. Entwistle. London: H. Milford. 1932. xviii + 154 pp. 7s. 6d.) when the third volume is nearly due. That volume II (which covers the year ending June, 1931) shows a marked advance over its predecessor in homogeneity was only to be expected after Professor Entwistle's team had settled down to work. There are, it is true, still some fields where the editor has not yet succeeded in finding contributors; and in two sections bibliographical lists—albeit not without comment—take the place of reasoned summaries. The various articles follow the order established in volume I and are mostly in the hands of the contributors to that volume. The section on 'Philology of the German Language' should surely have been entitled 'Germanic Philology' (*vide* 'Romance Philology') and might have been correspondingly extended. Fresh ground is broken by short contributions on Basque and Rumanian (both by the editor), and the volume is prefaced by an excellent article by Professor W. E. Collinson on 'International Languages.' The *Year-Book* has made a great stride forwards in establishing itself as indispensable to all who will keep abreast of Modern Language studies. J. G. R.

Professor W. Franz's standard *Shakespeare-Grammatik* reached its third edition in 1924. He has now published a supplement to it entitled *Shakespeares Blankvers mit Nachträgen zu des Verfassers Shakespeare-Grammatik in dritter Auflage* (Verlag des Englischen Seminars, Tübingen. 1932. 90 pp.). There is nothing more productive of variance than questions of prosody, and probably everyone will read this line or that in a way that is not the one prescribed by Professor Franz. For myself, I admit an anapæst in 'To chuse | you a Queene: | she shall not be so young' and in 'I, much | is the force | of heauen-bred Poesie' but not in 'As you are Friends, Schollers and Soldiers' where I should call 'Schollers' a trochaic foot, and not run its final syllable on to what follows. Again I scan: 'My Lord should to the Heauens [monosyllable as above] be contrary' and give 'contrary' its usual accent 'cóntrary.' But Professor Franz's knowledge and judgment are nearly infallible, and his treatise will be found instructive by all lovers of Shakespeare. Apart from prosodical matters, some other points are illuminated in this supplement: Shakespeare's use of the 'do'-form in questions, ellipsis and change of meaning, British and American English, and a few more. I cannot accept O. Ritter's etymology of 'slang' from thieves' (or soldiers') lang[uage]. Who ever heard of 'lang' as a short form of 'language'? And present usage in regard to the numeral form 'six and

fifty' can hardly be shown by a quotation from Sheridan. But I must not end on a note of disagreement. Professor Franz is the survivor of a great school of exact learning which has all but passed away, and his old friends will rejoice to receive this new proof of the continuance of his powers, and hope for more.

G. C. M. S.

Mr Louis B. Salomon makes two apologies for the 'tenuous thread' of his thesis (*The Devil take her: A Study of the Rebellious Lover in English Poetry*. University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1931. vii + 359 pp. 16s. 6d.) at pp. 65 and 296 f. He protests his own satisfaction but does not appear profoundly convinced himself of the value of examining the various revolts in English poetry against the system of courtly love. It is a pity that Mr Salomon chose this subject, or acquiesced in someone else's choice of it for him, because he has spirit (sometimes, unfortunately, inclining to slang) and seems worthy of sounder fare. His first chapter, reaching to 65 admirable pages, reviews the progress of love through English poetry and has access to plenty of good material. The rest of the chapters—'Farewells to Love,' 'Personal Revolts,' 'Reminders of Mortality,' and so on—are merely the result of scissors and paste and the author as well as his readers seems looking up and not being fed.

G. T.

In his *The Life and Works of José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi* (University of Pennsylvania. Publications in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. xxiii. Philadelphia. 1931. 141 pp. \$1.75) Mr Jefferson Rea Spell is the first to present a study of 'el pensador mexicano' with any claim to completeness. It does not transpire from his thesis that Lizardi was a notably original thinker, as he was certainly not a stylist nor a master of the technique of the novel; but in his ardent campaign of pamphleteering against the vices of the colonial régime he introduced eighteenth-century French thought into Mexico, and when press censorship forced him to find a new means of expression he became, with *El Periquillo Sarniento* (1816), the author of the first novel properly so called to issue from a Spanish press in North America, a fact that pays tribute to the official ban on 'materias profanas y fabulosas e historias fingidas,' for some eleven thousand volumes had already been published in Mexico City. The book was the more significant in that it gave new life to the picaresque tradition while investing it with a background essentially Mexican. One may regret that Mr Spell has not described more circumstantially the political system then tottering to its fall in Mexico. Lizardi's conflict with this must always rank high among his 'works.'

W. A.

Dr Chotzen, already known as an investigator of the poetry of Dafydd ap Gwilym, has published the inaugural lecture delivered in connexion with his habilitation as 'privaatdocent' in Celtic philology at Amsterdam on October 9, 1931, under the title *Primitieve Keltistiek in den*

Nederlanden ('S-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff. 1931. 58 pp. 1 fl. 20). He traces the growing interest of the Renaissance and later continental scholars in Celtic matters from Conrad Gessner of Zürich, Polydorus Vergilius and Ortelius onwards. Gessner quotes the Lord's Prayer in Welsh in *Mithridates* (1555), Hieronymus Megiserus in Irish in his *Specimen quinquaginta...linguarum* (Frankfort, 1600) and Merula and Pontanus in Breton in 1605 and 1606. A stimulus to Celtic studies was given by the discovery of the Roman remains at Katwijk in 1562 and the Nehelennia stone at Doornburg in 1647. Ortelius, Scaliger, De Laet and Van Boixhorn played their part by their recognition of the value of the work done by Lloyd, Camden, Powel and Davies, and even if their views have long been superseded, it may be said with truth that Dr Chotzen is taking his place in a long line of Dutch Celticists, among the greatest of whom is, assuredly, his teacher, Van Hamel. W. E. C.

A cordial welcome is due to the authorised translation—by Mr Spargo of Northwestern University—of Professor Holger Pedersen's *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century* (London: H. Milford. 1931. 360 pp. 21s.). After a brief survey of linguistic investigation before the nineteenth century the veteran scholar traces the growth of our knowledge of all the Indo-European languages and even a number of non-Indo-European families (pp. 99–140). He then treats of inscriptions and the history of writing, lucidly expounds the methods of comparative 'linguistics' (a term which the translator rightly regards as superior to 'philology' as an equivalent of *Sprogvidenskab*) and in a final chapter states the problems of the original home and affinities of the Indo-Europeans. The work is admirably illustrated with photographs, maps and specimens of inscriptions, and should prove a useful means of orientation even for those whose work lies outside the narrower field of linguistic science. W. E. C.

In *De första Germanerna* (offprint from *Finskt Museum*, 1929) Mr Arnold Nordling brings together an imposing mass of evidence in opposition to the 'substratum' theory of the speech-changes which differentiate Germanic from Indo-European. He demonstrates the fundamental conservatism of Germanic, which has retained many ancient features, e.g., remains of dual, injunctive, medio-passive, 'ablaut'-phenomena in the nominal declension and in the variant present stems, etc. Those consonantal changes which appear so striking are, he avers, no more remarkable than consonantal developments—without extraneous influence—within Germanic itself, e.g., in Modern Danish and Icelandic, and the fixation of stress on the root-syllable is paralleled by the regularisation of accents in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. He combats Professor Karsten's view that the oldest Germanic peoples of Finland and the Baltic are other than Scandinavian, stating that a study of the Swedish dialects of Finland and Esthonia points to a settlement from the northern regions of Sweden. He seeks to invalidate Feist's long list of alleged non-

Indo-European elements in the Germanic vocabulary by referring him to more recent etymological researches embodied, e.g., in Falk and Torp's and Hellquist's dictionaries, where many such forms are found to have cognates in other Indo-European languages. W. E. C.

In *De Germaansche Klankverschuiving. Een Hoofdstuk uit de Geschiedenis der Germaansche Taalwetenschap* (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 1931. 214 pp.), the first volume of a series of Dutch contributions to Germanic philology edited by Van Dam, Van Hamel, Kapteijn and De Vries, Mr Russer has traced in detail and from a critical standpoint the history of the attitude of philologists to one particular phenomenon, viz., the first consonantal sound-shift. He calls his work a 'reasoned bibliography' and he succeeds in showing how each theory in turn is coloured by the prevailing atmosphere, e.g., Romanticism, materialism and the idealistic reaction. He rejects the substratum hypothesis and seeks the explanation of the shift in the common speech-basis of the Germanic peoples, characterised in his opinion by slack articulation. He suggests that root-stress is an innovation due to the Germanic tendency to consistency and one-sided thinking! Only the extreme manifestations of the sound-shift in South Germanic are regarded as due to an alien influence. W. E. C.

The authoritative work of Professor T. E. Karsten on the Germanic peoples fully merited a wider circulation and Monsieur F. Mossé has now provided a French translation in *Les anciens Germains: Introduction à l'étude des langues et des civilisations germaniques* (Paris: Payot. 1931. 281 pp. 40 fr.), which has the additional advantage of bringing the matter up to date. Professor Karsten's strength lies in his intimate knowledge of the Finnish and Esthonian data, in his conversance with recent anthropological research, and in the sobriety of his judgment. In particular we welcome the résumé of the work of the runologists and note that the author rejects Feist's hypothesis of an Illyrico-Venetic origin of the runes in favour of the view propounded by Marstrander (*Norsk Tidsskrift*, vol. 1) and endorsed with qualifications by Hammarström, which founds the runic alphabet on a north Italian script with or without a Celtic intermediary. W. E. C.

In his *Faust and Faustus: a Study of Goethe's Relations to Marlowe* (*Washington University Studies: Language and Literature*, II. St Louis Washington University. 1931. 176 pp.), Professor Otto Heller has made a brave attempt to solve in the affirmative a problem which necessarily presents itself to every student of Goethe's *Faust*: was Goethe acquainted with Marlowe's drama when he first conceived his own? Although the very fairness with which Professor Heller puts forward his case prepossesses readers in his favour, I fear that he has not succeeded in raising the problem out of the domain of that 'Konjunkturalkritik' to which he frankly admits it has always belonged. It seems to me that a more rigid

exclusion of possible vestiges of the Marlowe tradition in Germany, in Puppenspiel and Völksschauspiel, was called for before tackling the problem of Goethe's own possible direct knowledge of the English play. I am, at least, not convinced that Goethe read *Faustus* before his attention was drawn to it by Wilhelm Müller's translation in 1818.

J. G. R.

Professor John C. Blankenagel's *The Drama of Heinrich von Kleist* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xiii + 262 pp. 18s.) is a useful work for English students of Kleist, especially as it contains excellent detailed analyses of the plots of Kleist's dramas. The study of the plays is preceded by a chapter of biography; but Kleist's Novellen are not discussed, although they might have been, in view of the light they throw on his dramatic art. The volume is evidently intended for the general reader unfamiliar with German, as extracts are quoted in translation; but it is essentially academic in form, and is provided, on the German model, with a complete bibliography down to the least significant of dissertations. It is difficult, however, to see what use can be made of this by a public which requires to have its German translated for it. The style in which the book is written is often unpleasantly turgid. To English readers this makes it the more grating to come upon racy Americanisms such as 'having coughed this tragedy from his chest' (p. 128).

J. G. R.